

IDEALS OF NON-CO-OPERATION

**Printed at
The Huxley Press, Madras**

IDEALS OF NON- CO-OPERATION

By LAJPAT RAI



S . G A N E S A N

PUBLISHER, TRIPPLICANE, MADRAS, S.E.

1924

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----------|
| PREFACE | v |
| CHAPTER | PAGE |
| I THE PROGRAMME | I |
| II RELIGIOUS UNITY AND INDEPENDENCE | 10 |
| III. PRACTICAL ISSUES | . . 19 |
| IV. UNTOUCHABILITY AND LABOUR | . . 28 |
| V. MODERATES AND CONGRESS-MEN .. | .. 39 |
| VI. THE IMMEDIATE NEED FOR SWARAJ | ... 48 |
| VII. THE NEW IDEAL IN ACTION | 56 |
| VIII. THE GREATNESS OF THE INDIAN PROBLEM | 64 |
| IX. THE DIRECT AIM IN VIEW | .. . 73 |
| X. THE NEED OF SELF-DETERMINATION | . 78 |
| APPENDICES | |
| I. A. B. C. OF INDIAN POLITICS | . . 89 |
| II CONGRESS RESOLUTIONS | .. . 119 |

PREFACE

THIS series of articles had its original circulation in different Indian Journals* at a time, after Mahatma Gandhi's arrest, when it appeared to me necessary to go back to our first principles and think over anew what the Non-co-operation movement stands for, what are its aims and ideals. They have been written with that purpose in view.

I trust that the articles themselves will entirely dissipate the common current opinion, that Non-co-operation is almost wholly a negative movement whose one object is to wreck the present bureaucratic Government, while substituting little or nothing in its place. That criticism has often been levelled at it, but any one who knows Mahatma Gandhi, its author and founder, can realise at once how unfounded such an opinion is. For it could not be untrue to say that Mahatma Gandhi's mind is vitally and essentially constructive, and any destructive operations involved in his programme are purely with a view to future constructive work. A field cannot be sown with a good seed until the ground is cleared of the weeds. A house cannot be built well unless the rubbish is cleared away from the foundation. So it has been necessary to do a great deal of clearing away of rubbish in Indian National life before the

* The Bombay Chronicle, The Tribune and The Modern Review.

building process could begin. But the constructive programme which was set in the forefront after Bardoli ought to convince any open mind that now, at any rate, the building process has begun in good earnest

I would wish to thank my two dear friends Mr. S E. Stokes of Kotgarh and Mr. C. F. Andrews of Santiniketan, who share with me most of these ideals and for the help they have rendered me by their criticism.

LALPAT RAI

IDEALS OF NON-CO-OPERATION

CHAPTER I

THE PROGRAMME

THE Non-co-operation movement has two aspects—negative, and positive. Ours is not, and was never intended to be, a movement for refusing co-operation when asked. We had been co-operating with the British Government for over a century and a half. We have abandoned co-operation as a protest against breaches of faith and promises, as well as for the reason of denial of fundamental rights. The very nature of our position made it abundantly clear to us that we could not adopt a programme of absolute and complete Non-co-operation. Absolute Non-co-operation with a *de facto* Government is an impossibility for a party which aims at achieving its object by “peaceful and legitimate means.” This was explained from the start. The very wording of the

2 IDEALS OF NON-CO-OPERATION

Non-co-operation resolutions (see appendix) adopted at Calcutta and Nagpur made it abundantly clear, and it was repeated from time to time in the speeches of the leaders.

The programme of Non-co-operation adopted was neither exhaustive nor comprehensive. Its principal object was so to change the psychology of the people as to bring to an end the present evil administration. This is not the place to write its history, or to record its successes and failures. I am simply considering its principles.

Let us first take its negative aspect. It started a number of boycotts such as the triple boycott of the Councils, Courts and Schools; a boycott of titles, honours and honorary offices; a boycott of services under the British, more particularly in the departments of Police and Army; and a refusal to pay taxes. Its affirmative or constructive side advocated:—

(a) The creation of a collective national will and national conscience

(b) The completest possible organization of the Indian National Congress with committees in villages, towns, cities and provinces, in order to give effect to it.

(c) Hindu-Muslim Unity.

(d) The manufacture and supply of Khaddar.

(e) The establishment of national schools, colleges and universities.

(f) The inauguration of national arbitration courts.

(g) The collection of a National Fund under the name of Tilak Swaraj Fund.

(h) The removal of Untouchability.

(i) The organizing of Labour.

Every one of these items is expressive of our political principles and of the way in which we propose to put them into practice.

(a), (b), (c), (h) and (i) practically form the basis of our future democracy. By Hindu-Muslim Unity we mean the unity of all the religious communities which form the Indian nation by having their home in this land. I have already, in another place, made some observations on this item, but the subject is so important as to require a more lengthy consideration.

The Hindus and the Muslims are the two principal communities of India. They are not only numerically the two most numerous communities, but are otherwise too the most important. A very small portion of the Muslim community is of foreign origin, the bulk being socially and ethnically one with the Hindus. The same may be said of the Jains, Sikhs and the vast bulk of Indian Christians. The Parsees have been long domiciled in India and have become acclimatised. The Buddhists are confined to Burma which, though included in the British Indian Empire, is not a part of India

4 IDEALS OF NON-CO-OPERATION

proper. We may, therefore, dismiss them from consideration. It is neither good for them nor for us that they should form part of the Indian nation. Of the remaining, the Sikhs and the Jains are the inheritors of Hindu culture. They are thus not only socially and ethnically one with the Hindus, but culturally too.

The Muslims, though the vast bulk of them are the descendants of Hindus, have adopted non-Indian religions and non-Indian cultures. Their culture is, therefore, a mixed product of Hindu and non-Hindu ideals and practices. The problem before us is not how to mix them or how to reconcile them, but how to integrate them. What we aim at is not the merging or the absorption of one into the other, but the integration of all into one whole, without in any way injuring or lessening each group individually. Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Sikhs and Jains will not have to cease to be such in order to be Indians. Let them but recognize themselves as Indians, as well as Muslims, Christians, etc., let them think of themselves as Indian Muslims, and Indian Christians, and then all will be well.

This involves the separate existence of each religious community, with the fullest possible religious and communal freedom, each of them contributing its best to the constitution, continuance, independence and prosperity of one National whole.

Is it possible? Yes. We have to make it

possible ; otherwise it is futile for us to think of Nationhood. As I have already remarked elsewhere, I can think of no time when Hindus or Muslims will cease to be such—not even for the wealth or the dominion of the whole world. Their religion and their faith are a deep reality. In their eyes, their faith is all in all. For them it comprises both worlds, this and the next. They cannot sacrifice either. They must have both or neither. It is possible that one of them may, at some future time, become supreme, to dominate over the rest by force, but that will not be a democratic India. That will be purely Hindu or Muslim rule. But it is clear that we, the Nationalists, (including the Moderates) are not aiming at such an India. Our idea of a future India is that of a genuine democracy.

How are we then going to realise it ? I am afraid we have not paid sufficient attention to the problem. We have shouted Hindu-Muslim unity from a thousand platforms and from house-tops, in season and out of season, but we have devoted little thought as to the process or processes by which we propose to achieve it. In the last three years, we have done valuable work in preparing the ground for united deliberations. The desire for it had existed. We have intensified it and created the atmosphere for a fruitful consideration of the subject. The spirit is there, the will is there, but no sound thinking has

actually been done to point out how we should set about it. The legacy left to us by the old Congress is still hampering us in our efforts.

The old Congress agitated for posts, places and powers. They wanted to be associated in the work of governing the country. For twenty years they did not put in any demand for self-government, only setting forth their grievances against the administration and demanding reforms. These reforms have been conceded and our countrymen have been associated in the government of the country. True, they are not quite satisfied with what they have obtained; but what they have obtained is sufficient in their eyes to justify their co-operation in the suppression of those who are now profoundly dissatisfied with the Government. Their satisfaction is evidently sufficiently great to induce them to support even those repressive laws which they had opposed, criticized and condemned before. They evidently believe that the Hindu-Muslim problem will best be solved by the spirit of competition which they in their admiration of European social philosophy have set in motion in the country.

As a result of *laissez faire* upon our part this competitive spirit is being extended into the communal sphere. The different religious communities are struggling each to get as much of Government patronage as they can secure. The principle of communal representation originally

accepted as a temporary measure by the Lucknow Congress in 1916, is now being extended to other communities and for purposes other than communal representation. Originally designed for the removal of Muslim fears, it has now been extended to Sikhs in the Punjab, and the Non-Brahmans in Madras. From Council representation it has been extended to representation in local bodies, at least in two provinces, the Punjab and the U P. In the Punjab, where the Muslims are in a majority, it is now being extended to public services and educational institutions. There is no guarantee that it will stop there. It is the fear of majority rule that is at the bottom of this device which has been invented for the ostensible protection of religious minorities. It is a crude and clumsy device, and is likely to land us in difficulties which no one is thinking of at present. The Non-Co-operation party, also, which aims at non-association with the irresponsible foreign Government, practically accepts the principle. I am afraid this does not take us nearer the solution of the real problem. May I ask if it is the last word on the subject? And if it is, why is it maintained that it is only a temporary arrangement? If it is a good workable principle, I see no reason why it should not be extended in favour of other communities and in spheres of life other than Legislative Councils. If, on the other hand, it is not a good principle, and by no means the last word,

why are no efforts being made to solve it on right lines and to discover what those lines are ?

It is significant that we have very little of Hindu-Muslim differences much less of riots in Indian India. Hyderabad is a State ruled by a Muslim sovereign, though the majority of the population is Hindu. Jammu and Kashmeer are States ruled by Hindus but the majority of the people in these are Muslims. Most of these Hindu-Muslim conflicts take place in the purely British-ruled territories and can be traced to the influence of English-educated Hindus and Muhammadans backed generally by foreign influence. The explanation is, in my judgment, simple. The European social philosophy favours the principle of individual and social competition. It teaches the doctrine of rights. It throws duties in the back-ground. From individual rights it leads to group rights, communal rights, and then to national rights. European social philosophy disregards the truth that rights must follow duties. Where rights come first and duties afterwards, competition becomes the rule of life. Where duties are first and rights result there-from, co-operation is the principle of social life. In India, the thought-currents set afloat by European social and economic ideals are backed by the Imperial policy of a foreign Government and consequently confusion becomes worse confounded. Merely the ending of this foreign rule, therefore, will not put an end to

the prevailing spirit of communal conflict. Something more is needed to bring about the religious unity, which must be the basis of a self-governing democratic State in India. What that 'something more' is must be earnestly sought for, and applied to the solution of the problem.

CHAPTER II

RELIGIOUS UNITY AND INDEPENDENCE

AN intimate acquaintance with those who generally take a leading part in these communal conflicts inclines me to say that it is not religion that is responsible for them, but the lack of religion. Neither can it be traced to a keen sense of duty to the community. The latter is falsely stimulated by motives more or less personal. An educated man, specially one well-versed in European social philosophy, is a clever man, is often an able man, with a knowledge of crowd or herd-psychology and knows how to raise issues and lead people not so gifted as himself. He is not necessarily a religious man, or even a good man. More often than not, personal ambition is the inspiring incentive. True religion, as I have said, places duties before rights. True sociology emphasises co-operation as against competition. Competition as the rule of life is a modern teaching, yet it is, at the most, a half-truth. It has landed the world in a universal conflict—country against country, nation against nation, community against community, class against class, individual against individual.

Science has largely eliminated the dividing lines of the world. It has destroyed space and

distance It has brought the races of man nearer to one another; but only in body, not in heart. To the old causes of conflict, struggle, competition and war, it has added new ones. Formerly men fought for honour, for country, for religion and for gold Now men fight for coal, for iron, and for oil. In the last analysis the fight is for power, now as before, though the ostensible objects are different. Comparisons are difficult and odious, but it would seem that, while the achievements of modern science are magnificent on the material side, their reaction on the moral and the spiritual side has been deplorable.

The task before us is to evolve new social values from modern conditions of life; and to carry on an extensive propaganda in favour of the co-operative view of life as against the competitive. This may perhaps sound paradoxical from the mouth or pen of a professed Non-co-operator. But it is the truth. The position of the Indian Non-co-operator is perfectly logical, and there is nothing in it which cannot be reconciled with the above view. Our non-co-operation is only a means to an end.

We believe that the present is a condition of absolute chaos and anarchy. It is unnatural, unsocial and non-co-operative. It is productive of the greatest possible friction not only between the ruler and the ruled, but also between the different classes and sections of the community. Chaos and anarchy are not always the product of lack of Government ;

12 IDEALS OF NON-CO-OPERATION

they may be due to bad Government, to over-Government and to class-Government. Government is in no way always synonymous with order, peace and prosperity. We believe that even Europe is in a state of anarchy. The war was fought to save European civilisation, but European civilisation did not deserve to be saved and it has not been saved. All Europe is at war. This outward peace is only a sham peace. Conflict, suspicion, distrust, hatred, enmity are the order of the day. Not only are the nations fighting against each other, but even internally, classes and sections are mutually destructive. The whole world is involved in war, Asia, Africa and America—not one of the continents has escaped.

We, in India, are non-co-operating with the Government, in order to remove at least one cause of this world war. What we want is very simple,—not a right to participate in these wars, as the partnership in the Empire desired by our Moderate leaders might mean, but freedom to live our own life, freedom to build and mould our own institutions, and leave to co-operate with other nations in building up a new world. Holding this view, I believe my observations are not inconsistent with my position as Non-co-operator with the Government of India. I am only too anxious to co-operate, whenever such co-operation will lead to a useful and serviceable purpose.

RELIGIOUS UNITY & INDEPENDENCE 13

It is my conviction that the best way to bring about a true Hindu-Muslim unity is not by ignoring their differences, nor by emphasising them, nor by dividing the nation both longitudinally and latitudinally into so many compartments by communal and class representation in the Councils, corporations and services, but by trying to make men truly religious and by asking each of them to undertake the responsibilities and duties of the whole. The recent thought of Europe favours the idea of a pluralist State based on the rights of individuals. A French writer (De Maeztu) observes :— “ The dilemma which would make us choose between the State and anarchy is false. There is another alternative, that of plurality and the balance of powers, not merely within the nation, but in the family of nations.” To that part of this observation which speaks of ‘balance’ an American writer objects. Says Madame M. P. Follet :—

“ But whenever you have balance in your premise, you have anarchy in your conclusion. The weakness of the reasoning involved in the balance of power argument has been exposed in so much of the war literature of the last three years, which has exploded the balance of power theory between nations, that little further criticism is needed here. Unity must be our aim to-day. When you have not unity, you have balance, or struggle, or domination, of one over others. The nations of Europe refuse

domination, aim at balance, and war is the result! ”

Further on, comparing the Monistic State with the Unifying State, she remarks :—“The true Monistic State is merely the multiple State working out its own unity from infinite diversity. But the unifying State shows us what to do with that diversity. What advantage is that diversity. The Monistic State has already ceased to exist. In theory the State is still supreme, but in practice there are many sovereign groups inside every State. Men’s loyalties are by no means undivided. There are many persons in every State whose loyalty to the State is only secondary to their loyalty to other groups within the State, if it is to be always ‘cove-ting,’ ‘fighting,’ ‘balancing.’ Only in the unifying State do we get the full advantage of diversity when it is gathered up into significance and pointed action.

“The practical outcome of the balance theory will be first antagonistic interests, then jealous interests, then competing interests, then dominating interests, as a fatal climax ”

The communal representation theory is based on the idea of antagonistic or separate communal interests of the two communities. Therefore, the above remarks are quite pertinent to the state of things aimed at by the advocates of the communal interests. The latter maintain that in common

electorates the majority may possibly sweep aside the minority. In the interests of the latter, it is necessary to give them separate representation ; and in their opinion communal representation is the best way of doing it. In some provinces the Hindus are in majority, in the others Muslims. Communal representation will thus secure the balance of power between these communities. But Madame Follet maintains that "no theory of the State can have vitality which is merely a plan of representation. If Parliaments are composed of various groups or interests, the unification of those interests has to take place in Parliament. But then it is too late. We must go further back than our legislatures for the necessary unifying. We do not want legislatures full of opposing interests. The ideas of the groups become too crystalized by the time their representatives get to the Parliaments, in fact they have often hardened into prejudices. Moreover, the representatives could not go against their constituencies ; they would be pledged to specific measures. The different groups would come together, each to try to prevail, not to go through the only genuine democratic process that of trying to integrate their ideas and interests." If the object is unity, that will not be obtained by separate representation of the communities or the classes. Just as it is futile to ignore differences, it is equally futile to aim at unity by separateness. In the language of Madame Follet, these differences

ought to be integrated. The process of integration can only be understood and then put into practice by those who first understand what democracy means and how we should proceed to form a democratic State.

"Democracy" she says, "is not a sum in addition. Democracy is not brute numbers; it is a genuine union of individuals."

She does not believe in majority rule, nor that majority rule as at present understood is democracy. "Majority rule rests on numbers; democracy rests on the well-grounded assumption, that society is neither a collection of units, nor an organism, but a net-work of human relations. Democracy is not worked out at the polling booths. It is the bringing forth of a genuine collective will, one to which every single being must contribute the whole of his complex life, as one in which every single being must express the whole at one point. Thus the essence of democracy is creative. The technique of democracy is the group organisation."

She believes in the evolution of a collective will by the process of group organizations and explains the process by which differences should be integrated:—

"Unity, not uniformity, must be our aim. We attain unity only through variety. Differences must be integrated, not annihilated, nor destroyed. Anarchy means unorganized, unrelated difference;

RELIGIOUS UNITY & INDEPENDENCE 17

co-ordinated unified difference belongs to our ideal of a perfect social order. We don't want to avoid our adversary, but to 'agree with him quickly.' We must, however, learn the technique of agreeing. As long as we think of difference as that which divides us we shall dislike it; when we think of it as that which unites us, we shall cherish it. . .

The ignoring of differences is the most fatal mistake in politics, or industry, or international life; every difference that is swept up into a bigger conception, feeds and enriches society; every difference which is ignored feeds on society and eventually corrupts it. Give a place for your difference, welcome my difference, unify all difference in the larger whole—such is the law of growth. The unifying difference is the eternal process of life—the creative synthesis; the highest act of creation, the at-one-ment. ”

Again, discussing the organisation of the future world State she makes some observations, which are pertinent to the point under discussion. She remarks as follows:—“Superficial moralists try to get us to like some other nationality by emphasizing all the things we have in common, but war can never cease until we see the value of differences; that they are to be maintained, not blotted out. . The pacifists have wanted us to tolerate our enemies; and the more extreme ones to turn the other cheek when smitten. But tolerance is intolerable, and we cannot dwell among enemies. We

must, indeed, as the extreme militarists tell us "wipe out" our enemies; but we do not wipe out our enemies by crushing them. The old-fashioned hero went out to conquer his enemy; the modern hero goes out to disarm his enemy, through creating a mutual understanding."

One more extract and I have done with Madame Follet for the present. She writes the following:—"In the place of sentimental patriotism we want a common purpose,—a purpose evolved by the common life, to be used for the common life. Some of our biologists mislead us when they talk of homogeneity of the herd as the aim of nations.... If a nation is a crowd, patriotism is a mere hypnotism; if a nation is a true federal State built up of interlocking and ascending groups, then patriotism is self-evolved." "Inter-dependence is the key-note of the relations of nations, as it is the key-note of the relations of individuals within a nation."

CHAPTER III

PRACTICAL ISSUES

If these principles have any value in our eyes, then let us try to apply them to the solution of our own problem *viz.*, the evolving of a national unity without sacrificing any of our vital differences.

Let us take the Hindu-Muslim question first. What are the differences between these two communities? First, there are the religious differences. Each party wants full religious freedom,—freedom of belief, of worship, of association for religious purposes, and of expression and propaganda. Why should they not have it? To a large extent they have it now. Why should it not be guaranteed permanently in the future Indian State? This should be the first article of our future constitution. The clash which comes out of religious observances, festivals, and celebrations, as well as from the proximity of places of worship—why is it not possible for a Committee of Hindu and Mahomedan leaders to sit together and arrive at a full and thorough understanding with regard to such matters? It should not be impossible to arrive at an understanding about the location of temples and masjids in our cities, towns and villages, *e.g.*, in the case of new buildings. As to religious festivals and celebrations it should not be

impracticable to regulate them in such a way as to ensure all reasonable satisfaction to all parties without much room for sudden collisions.

There is again the cow question. There are two aspects of it—religious and economic. I believe a way can be found by which the religious susceptibilities of both parties may be respected. The other day a Muslim Maulvi told me that if the Muslim rights of Qurbanı for three days in the year were conceded, the Muslims might be willing to agree to a prohibition of cow-slaughter during the rest of the year. It is true that the Muslim religion does not enjoin the sacrifice of a cow for any religious purpose even in these 3 days. For the last 3 years the Muslim leaders have been exhorting their co-religionists to desist as far as possible from sacrificing the cow even on these three days. But they object to any legislation against that right.

On the other hand, certain pronouncements of Mahatma Gandhi have led the Hindus to hope that he will succeed in stopping cow-slaughter not by legislation, but by the good-will of the Muslims. This hope, the Hindus believe, will not be realized as the Muslims will not in any case consent to abandon their right of Qurbanı. The present situation is extremely dangerous. It is full of uncertainty, distrust and bitterness. A kind of fear is always hanging over our heads. No serious effort has been made to compound the differences. When once

the Hindu-Muslim differences on this question are settled, it will be easier to take up the question with our Christian countrymen. I use the word countrymen deliberately. It does not include foreigners; it means and includes all such as have made India their home regardless of their place of birth. With Christians there is no question of religion in this matter. For them it is purely a food question and surely it can be settled on general social and economic grounds.

Then there is the State patronage of denominational institutions, including the patronage of local bodies. Why not organise a Committee of qualified men to study what in this respect has been done by other nations? Once that information is collected, we can proceed to lay down certain general principles for the observance of our future State. I, for one, would prefer an absolute neutrality. The State should not patronise, or in any way help, any religious or denominational institution, except to secure it in full the liberty guaranteed in the Constitution.

Some such programme as this might be adopted:—all religious endowments or denominational benefactions to be strictly under the control of ecclesiastical bodies except such as volunteer to be controlled by the State; any disputes as to rights of property between two or more religious communities to be settled by courts to be specially constituted.

for the purpose by the mutual consent of the parties; purely educational interests to be looked after by the State on the basis that it is the duty of the State to provide free and compulsory secular education and educational facilities for every child, youth as well as adult.

Lastly, we have the question of the employment in Government service. This is a very difficult question, but it would lose its present importance as soon as all the communities are well educated and able to look after their economic interests regardless of any religious or communal distinctions. It never arises in such countries as France or America where such different interests are never brought forward by educated men in the matter of service of the State.

It is possible that in the transitional stage we may have to make some concessions to existing prejudices, but let us lay down our ideals and then compound the present differences in such a way as to be a help in the attainment of the ideals in course of time. What we need is a co-relation of interests to end in a genuine community of all classes and sections in the nation, in the development of a national ethics, a national will, the self-evolving of a higher loyalty above all and including all, the full responsibility of every community, class and section 'for the welfare of every other.' More courts of arbitration will not do. We need machinery, not

for settling disputes, but for preventing disputes from arising; not merely for interpreting past relations, but for giving expression to new relations. Among all sensible and genuinely patriotic men an idea is gaining ground that we need not only a Federal India, but also a Federal Asia. There can be no hope of a Federal Asia unless we have first formed and evolved a Federal India. A Federal India is only possible by the integration and compounding of Hindu-Muslim differences on the principle that for the fullest expression and expansion of Islamic life, Muslims need the fullest co-operation and co-ordination of Hindus in making a Federal Asia, and the latter need the fullest help and sympathy of the Muslims in making possible a Federal India. The future of both India and Asia demands a sense of full mutual and reciprocal responsibility on the part of the followers of all the religions that are to be found in Asia. As every Indian, be he of any religion or class, must feel himself responsible for the whole Indian Nation, so must every Asian feel a similar responsibility for the whole of Asia.

An eminent French publicist has said that India is the heart of Asia, and the solution of India's problem is the central problem of Asia. And, verily, it is true. As India led the way in the conquest of Asia by Europe, so India must also lead in the liberation of Asia from European domination. ~~As~~

24 IDEALS OF NON-CO-OPERATION

India is the heart of Asia, so Asia is the heart of the world. Asia contains more than half the human race. It was the birth place of all religions, all culture and all civilization. As long as it is in bondage, the world cannot be 'free. It is futile to talk of a democratic world as long as Asia does not regain its lost self. Only a free Asia can restore the world to a state of peace and tranquillity. Asia can truly teach the doctrine of one in all and all in one. Asia alone can teach that the free man is he who concedes full freedom to every one else. Asia alone—and in Asia, India principally—can teach that “self and others are merely different points of view of one and the same experience, two aspects of the same thought”; that “freedom is the harmonious unimpeded working of the law of one’s own nature” (one’s Swadharma) and that “the true nature of every man is found only in the whole”; and that only that person can do the work of the world joyously who feels that he is the world. Let us not forget that we desire freedom—individual, national or continental—not only for ourselves, our country and our continent, but for every human being, every nation and the whole world of nations and men. Our ideal is a world ideal, a whole civilization in which the ideals and the civilization of every nation can find a place. We want to give to the world the best in us, and that is only possible when we are freed from the shackles of an alien civilization and the bondage of

a culture that is being thrust down our throats by force. Not that we dislike or hate the European civilization as such, but because we are not free to accept or reject it. We want to love it, if we are only free to love it. No one can make us love it by compulsion.

We must set to work to settle the Hindu-Muslim differences in such a way as to prevent disputes arising, and to prevent disputes interfering in the development and evolution of that collective will, without which nationhood is impossible. Above all, the problem is a problem in psychology. At present every local riot, every urban and agrarian dispute, is liable to be converted into a Hindu-Muslim dispute. Suppose a riot takes place in a certain place in which the Hindus and Muslims quarrelled or fought with each other on different sides, why should the Hindus and Muslims of other places make it a point of difference between them?

It may be said that it is human nature that forces communal sympathy. But should not the same human nature dictate to us the need of localising that dispute, preventing its spread over a wider area? Why cannot the Hindus and Muslims of other places show their sympathy for everyone of those that have suffered and been injured, whatever his religion? Why must we continue to appeal for the intervention of a third party to punish the guilty and recompense the injured? Does insistence

on punishment prevent the recurrence of such events? Revenge is not the way to peace. War will never end war. It will only give rise to fresh wars. Why must we attribute the occurrence to religious difference?

The reply is, because our minds have been so moulded and our psychology has been so formed as to drive us unconsciously to this course. The task before us then is to change the psychology of our people. Just as in family quarrels, so in quarrels and riots between Hindus and Hindus, and Muslims and Muslims, we must compose differences by a process of integration. I do not agree with those who say that our unity is mere lip unity at present. But I do believe that the change is not sufficiently marked and substantial to prevent our relapsing into the old condition by the merest stray occurrence of the most insignificant kind.

There is greater need of this integration and understanding in urban areas and among educated men of both the communities than in villages and among ignorant people. Denominational institutions, denominational clubs, denominational newspapers, denominational social gatherings to the exclusion of mixed ones are not the best ways of bringing about the understanding. There should be more occasions for 'getting together' to know each other, to understand each other, to appreciate each other, and to help each other. It is natural for

a Muslim to seek and like the company of a fellow Muslim. It is only natural that a Muslim should help and sympathise with a fellow Muslim, but this liking, this helping and this sympathy should not be attributed to a dislike of the Hindus, or to a conspiracy against the latter, or *vice versa*. I have often observed that if a Muslim official is kinder to a fellow Muslim than he is to Hindus, the latter begin to grumble about his "partiality." But partiality for one does not mean hostility to or hatred of the other. It is illegal and mean for judicial officers to be partial. It may be equally condemnable for a Government official to abandon the path of impartiality in his dealings with the public. But impartiality is not always synonymous with absolute similarity of treatment towards all. Let us try to be generous and charitable in analyzing and ascribing motives, and that will substantially help in bringing about that change of national psychology which we all so desire. Let me not be understood to be condemning denominational activities of all kinds, and as such. They may be a necessary stage in this period of transition. But, what I do plead for is a more frequent coming together, not in order to settle disputes, not only to prevent disputes, but also to understand and appreciate each other's point of view in a spirit of charity and generosity.

CHAPTER IV

UNTOUCHABILITY AND LABOUR

As to the best method of evolving a common will, I have some constructive suggestions to make. But before I come to them, I must discuss the other items of the Congress programme and examine their basic implications.

The items of untouchability and the organization of labour are clear indications of our ideals of democracy. Untouchability is the result of prejudice against certain kinds of labour. It may include certain elements of religious and social prejudices also. We have to remove both. No prejudice of any kind must be permitted to vitiate our future democracy. We do not propose to do it by a process of levelling down, but by that of levelling up. Our ideas of 'equality' are not based on the theory of 'natural rights,' but on that of service. No form of labour is degrading which serves social ends and which society needs. If there are any forms of labour which involve the degradation of the individual, or groups of individuals, they must be either abolished, or the element of degradation must be removed from them. No one should suffer humiliation because of performing functions and doing services which serve the social purposes; but these services

have by a curious twist of human mind been made the reason of their performers and class being looked down upon by the rest of the society. No one should be looked down upon because of his labour, or his religion, or his race. Every human being who has his home in India, whatever his race or religion or occupation, is an Indian, a member of the Indian Nation, and entitled to be treated as an equal among equals. Some people object to the inclusion of this item in our political programme because they say 'this is encroaching on Dharma or religion.' But even a superficial examination of the question shows either that the objectors do not properly realise either the meaning and scope of 'Dharma' or else that their ideas of political liberty are hopelessly muddled. It is inconceivable to think of a democracy which recognises 'untouchability' as a part of individual 'Dharma' and as a permissible form of religious or social prejudice. It is useless to talk of a democratic State as long as this kind of prejudice sways our minds and influences our conduct towards those from whom we differ in religion, or whose forms of occupation we dislike.

Some people condemn this item on the ground of expediency or policy. But one cannot remain silent on a question which involves the degradation of a basic principle of this kind for reason of expediency or policy. The process of building up a nation is a moral process. You cannot engage in a work of

this kind with success by practising duplicity. If you want all the people to join your movement, you must take each and all into confidence. You must tell them frankly and truly what you think of them and how you propose to associate with them in the great work before you. If you start with reservations, you weaken the very foundation of your structure and pollute the very source of your vitality. It is sufficiently humiliating that we should have to mention untouchability at all in our programme ; but to have avoided it for fear of offending the sensibilities of some classes of our countrymen would have been even worse. It would have been immoral. The democratic mind must clear itself of all such prejudices.

The inclusion of this item in our programme does not imply that the Congress proposes to take in hand itself to elevate the untouchables or to raise them up in the social scale. Nothing of the kind. The untouchables must elevate themselves. It will be wrong on our part to look upon them as objects of pity or sympathy. It is a kind of presumption which must be given up, if we are to evolve a truly democratic mind. We simply declare our faith and pledge ourselves to act in the light of that faith.

This is a step in self-education,—a preparation for Swaraj, a filling up of the preliminaries of democracy, and not an act of patronage towards the “untouchables.” In all such cases the work before

us is one of education, association and organization. First we educate ourselves, next we give our ideas to others and more particularly to the persons concerned and offer such help as circumstances permit us to render. We first communicate our faith and our ideas to them, and then by actively associating with them enable them to organise themselves efficiently. It may be that for a time the duty of guiding would devolve on us which should in no way be shirked, but eventually they themselves must lead their movement and try to come into line with the rest of their countrymen, to take their share of the country's work. The work is not to be undertaken in a spirit of charity, but under a sense of duty—not duty towards them, but duty towards ourselves, because we cannot be free unless they too are free. To evolve a democracy, to constitute a free State, to develop a Government of Swaraj is impossible unless all parts of the nation are in a position to make their contribution to the common purpose, the common will and the common work.

The same spirit must govern our relations with or towards labour. The Labour problem has several sides. In essence, it is an economic problem. But it is also social and political. Labour must come into its own before the world can be truly democratic. The present condition of things is barbaric. The producers of wealth are the poorest, the most backward and the most miserable

of all the human beings composing the nation. If there is anything in European civilization which we should, under no circumstances, imitate and copy, it is their capitalistic economic life and their industrialism, their commercialism and class divisions. It would be far better for us to remain a comparatively poor nation than to become rich by the wholesale introduction into our country of European industrialism. Most of us are familiar with the pictures of Industrial Europe drawn by Socialist writers of all schools. The work was started by Karl Marx. His prognostications have turned to be so true in some of their main conclusions that now there is a practical unanimity among Western thinkers about the indescribable evils of the capitalistic system.

What is Socialism? In essence, it is a protest against the degradation to which the working part of humanity has been reduced by the unproductive, leisured class. We, in India, are as much the victims of it as the rest of the world. Modern Industrialism and Modern Imperialism are twin sisters. The one follows the other. Europe and America are only democratic in name. They may have a veneer of democracy about them, but the spirit which dominates their life is that of Imperialism. Capitalism is only another form of Imperialism. Capitalistic Great Britain, in her benevolence and by 'virtue of the faith' which she possesses, has so far given us only a small dose of the elixir which

has been her own 'making.' It is no fault of ours that she has not given us a full dose, though we have been clamouring for it most insistently. She has been rather miserly in this matter, not because she wanted to save us from its evil effects, but because her own material interests did not allow her to be more liberal. We wanted very much to build our industries on the same lines as she built hers. We have built some. And if we have not built to our heart's content, it is because she would not let us. But as a consequence of what she has allowed us to do we have already a labour problem on hand.

But the ideals underlying the Non-co-operation movement are entirely different from this. Our own indigenous economic ideals are represented symbolically by the Khaddar movement (~~hand-spun~~ and ~~hand-woven~~ cloth). I will deal with it in its proper place. In this place, I have referred to it only ~~because it is intimately~~ related to the labour problem.

I ~~am afraid~~ that we cannot altogether shut out Industrialism and if we cannot shut it out, what we have to do is to be prepared to face the consequences. Organising labour on the lines it has been done in Europe is one of the consequences. In our eyes, organizing labour means placing its members in a position to meet organized capital on such terms that the latter may not be able to take advantage of their ignorance and their disorganized state. Here

again it is a question of education and association. What we have to do and to do quick is to provide for them facilities of education and association. They must be trained to think for themselves and to take up their proper place in the nation that we are proposing to build.

I notice that there is some difference of opinion on the question whether we should use labour organization for political purposes. In my judgment the question does not arise. Who are we to use the labour organization for political purposes? Or for any purpose at all. The units of these organizations are as much 'we' as the others. If some of us are better educated, more experienced and better trained in the work of organization, then all we can do and should do is to place our education, our experience and our training at the disposal of our less fortunate brethren in order to help and guide them in the work before them. To think of using them for any purpose whatsoever is a presumption unworthy of the great aim we have in view. Nor do I believe that there is any Non-co-operator leader who means as much. What they mean is that labour organizations are as much interested in the movement for Swaraj as any other class of the great population inhabiting this land, and that, as such, it is or will be their duty when they are well organized, to take part in the struggle for it.

There are some among us, on the one hand who believe that the class war between capital and labour is already on; that in this war, Indian labour should fight on the same lines and should conduct itself in the same way as European labour has done; that there is no possibility of an integration of the differences that exist between Labour and Capital; and that labour in India should take as active a part in bringing about a revolution in India as European labour is taking or threatens to take in Europe. There are, on the other hand, others among us who believe that we should do all we can to keep out the class war that is threatening the destruction of European civilization. Can we do it? If so, how? Of course, we cannot even think of doing so, if it involves any diminution of the status of labour in the democracy we propose to build up. Better war than any degradation of human beings or human dignity. But is the class war the last word on the subject? Are not European and American thinkers engaged in a serious attempt to find out a peaceful solution of the problem? Shall we not do well to study that thought to see if it can help us? Shall we not ask both Capital and Labour in India to assimilate that thought and take timely steps to prevent the development of the present differences into a class war? Again, cannot we agree to put a stop to the further development of this industrialism in India,

so that the coming danger may be confined to a limited area and to limited numbers? This is only possible if we are free to determine our economic policy without any dictation from without and with an eye to our own future.

It cannot be done under a regime of free trade thrust upon us from without; nor can it be done with the doctrine of *laissez faire* ruling supreme. Nor can it be done, if we are obsessed by the interests of an industrially-run Empire, and go mad after British Empire Exhibitions.

Let me now explain fully what "Khaddar" stands for. India has, from times immemorial, been a land of cottage industries. Before the advent of the British, we not only manufactured for our own needs but catered for the most refined taste in the world. We should have no prejudice against machinery such as can be used in cottages and without much mechanical skill to mend and repair when out of order. We do not want to make profit of other peoples' wants. Why then should we go in for mass production? It will be an ideal condition of life for us if we can have a democracy pledged to "plain living and high thinking" in which working for wages is reduced to the minimum and we may be practically self-sufficient without being exclusive. We do not want to be isolated. We desire to have the fullest and the most intimate relations with the rest of the world, but we must be

an equal among equals, neither dominant nor dependent. That is our ideal of a free democratic India. The least we can do is to spread our ideal and to educate our people in it. "Khaddar" represents our economic ideal of production for individual needs,—and for the needs of the family, the city and the nation; production by hand and with the aid of simple tools and simple machinery; production for use; production virtually by all classes and grades of society in the nation; production in homes and in shops as distinguished from big factories; with freedom to the producer to sell his goods in the open market, at the best prices he can get through co-operative methods independent of the capitalist. We can only keep competition in check by co-operative methods—co-operation in production and co-operation in distribution. To some people this might look "primitive," retrogression, going backward. But the world never goes back, though it may appear to do so.

The progress in mechanical processes made in the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries must be used for the good of humanity, and not for the exploitation of the greater bulk of it by a few fortunate ones in possession of the means to use it for profit, and for power. To let this power be concentrated in few hands involves the greatest misfortune that can befall mankind. The subject is so well and so exhaustively discussed in social treatises

and works of independent thinkers like 'A. E.' Mr. Bertrand Russell, Mr. J. A. Hobson, Mr. & Mrs. Sidney Webb and others, that it would be a presumption on my part to try to reproduce their thoughts in my language. All that I intended to do was to explain our economic ideal and what "Khaddar" signifies to us. To a certain extent our ideal differs from theirs. The two are not necessarily identical. But both have certain elements in common. The rationale of it can be studied in their writings and then applied to our circumstances. It may be that we may have to adopt some of their thoughts; but we should never forget that our circumstances being different from theirs, we cannot fully apply their remedies. Neither they nor we are writing on a clean slate. The structure of their society is different from ours; and so are their history, their traditions and the spirit of their culture. All these must be considered in the building up of our social, economic and political ideals. Europe and Asia must solve their problems, each in its own way, each obtaining such support and help from the other's thought and experiences as is readily adaptable in the light of its particular circumstances and conditions of life and its own ideals. Thus we can join hands in building a new world, without the one imposing on the other and without the one dominating and exploiting the other.

CHAPTER V

MODERATES AND CONGRESS-MEN

So far I have tried to discuss our ideal of democracy from the indications of it given in the Congress programme. I am now going to consider what sort of Government we desire for India and how we propose to form it. There are many among our Moderate countrymen who probably agree with us in our ideal of democracy, though there is a kind of fundamental difference between them and us as to the means to be adopted in order to approach or achieve that ideal. For example, they want to remove the untouchability of the untouchables almost in the same spirit as the foreign Christian missionary. For them it is all a question of social reform. They will not make it an item, and a necessary item, of their political propaganda. Their way of doing it is by appealing to the sense of philanthropy of the higher castes and the richer men among their countrymen. They always think and talk of elevating them. I confess that most of the Congressmen also do not fully realize the importance of the question, nor develop the necessary spirit. But to my judgment the timidity of the former is greater than the ignorance or lack of understanding in the latter.

Similarly on the Labour question, they are in favour of organising Labour and are doing valuable work in that line. But here again, they are afraid of the true principles that should underlie their efforts. Believers still in the Manchester school of economics, putting their faith in the industrial methods of the West, they believe in providing legislative protection for Labour, almost on the same lines on which it has been done in the West. It is like creating a disease, and then setting out to cure it. I have so far not seen one valuable thought emerging from them to show how they propose to prevent the problem becoming as serious in India as it has become in Europe. They have not told us how they would cut it at the roots.

A remedial factory law, shorter hours, better sanitation, more light, good creches, efficient inspection and compensation for injuries, are very good in their own way, but they are like shutting the stable door after the horse has gone out. They have never told us how they would tackle the problem if they had full power to solve it in their own way. Some of them, or rather most of them, including even the best of them, gibe at Socialism without telling us how they would save India from Industrialism. In fact we are not sure if they see any evil in Industrialism of the kind Europe has evolved. They are constantly talking of the industrial progress of their country, as if they were dying for the

growth of Manchesters, Liverpools and Birminghams in India' Do we really want the prototypes of these cities in India or what they stand for? Do they constitute the glory of England? I have seen all of them, and I have always wished that we may not have cities like them.

To raise the labour problem, and then try to solve it, is hardly a way to attain our object. To call in Capitalism to save us from its evil effects is hardly wisdom. To introduce and develop Industrialism and then to build up a Labour party does not appeal to me. It may be that under the present system of Government that is the only way! But then, why not make a 'serious attempt to do away with the present system of Government? A man cannot call himself 'democratic' and also stand for 'safety first' for this undemocratic Government. If you worship a monster, you must be prepared to feed it and to humour it. Therein comes the fundamental difference between the Moderates and the Congressmen. The ideals of democracy held by the former may include the uplifting of the untouchables and the relief of Labour, but that is neither democracy nor the democratic method, if it is attempted in the wrong spirit.

The same lack of principles, or the same difference in principles, distinguishes their political programme. They want 'Reforms'; we want a National State. They want reforms from above;

we want building up from below. They are after boons and concessions ; we claim what is ours. They want a constitution to be framed for them by the British Legislature ; we desire freedom to do it ourselves. They want to reform a Government imposed from without by force. We want to make a Government of our own, which would be a natural outcome, if not a full development, of our ideals of democracy. We want a Government of the people, to be built up and constituted by the people ; they are trying to get a Government not by the mandate or the help or the demand of the people, but by the benevolence of the British

But do they want a Government of the people ? Perhaps in the last resort. At present, what they are helping to form, is a combined Government of the foreign Imperialist and the Indian Capitalist—a hybrid which satisfies neither the one nor the other and ignores the people. All their lives they have been cursing the foreign bureaucracy only at last to replace it by themselves. They have ended by compromising with it and by merging themselves in it. This was inevitable. Their immediate ideals and their methods could only lead them there. To quote a writer, speaking of the reformers in the United States (which is already a democracy of the kind our Moderate countrymen desire) “ their methods were three : (i) Change in the form of Government (Charters etc.) (ii) the

maintenance of 'good' men in office and exhortation to induce the 'people' to elect them."

"The idea of 'good' men in office," continues the same author, "was the object of many reform associations. They thought that their job was to find three or four 'good' men and then once a year to hypnotize the electorate to 'do their duty,' and put the men into office, and then all would go well. . . . What a futile and childish idea which leaves out of account the whole body of citizenship! . . . The wide-spread fallacy that good officials made a good city is one which lies at the root of much of our thinking, and insidiously works to ruin our best plans, our most serious efforts. This extra-ordinary belief in officials, this faith in the panacea of a change of charters, must go. If our present mechanical Government is to turn into a living, breathing, pulsing life, it must be composed of an entire citizenship educated and responsible."

We also have had 'good' men in office both at Whitehall and at Delhi, Calcutta, and Bombay. We have had a Morley and a Crewe at Whitehall; a Hardinge and a Reading at Delhi; a Carmichael and a Ronaldshay at Calcutta. When the Liberals of Great Britain came into power in 1906, with a childish faith in 'good' men, I, on behalf of the Lahore Indian Association, cabled to Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman to appoint John Morley to

the India Office, little knowing that within a year of his taking office, that 'good' man would deport me to Burma without even the semblance of a trial, and that within five years he would have laws put on the Statute Book which would cut at the root of the few liberties we had before that 'good' man came into office. The two Repressive Acts under which I have recently been incarcerated were enacted when he was in office.

But some one might say all these 'good men were British.' The Moderates agitated for an Indian agency. Very well. Substitute 'Indians' for men in the above quotation and you have the present situation. Can any one doubt that almost all the Indians appointed as Councillors and Ministers under the reformed regime are 'good' men? On the whole, the country could not have placed better men into office. What have they done? The question had better be left unanswered.

My present belief is that even if the British Parliament had granted us full 'Self-Government,' we should not have done much better. What matters most is not the thing granted, but how we get it. I have always believed (and proclaimed my belief from house-tops) that Self-Government is not a thing to be gifted or granted. If so, gifted or granted, it shall not be of much value, and we might not be able to retain it, and it is a pleasure to find my idea supported by the latest thought on political

theory. Says Mrs. Follet:—"It is impossible to give Self-Government; no one has the right to give it; no one has the power to give it. . . ."

Self-Government must always be grown. Sovereignty is always a psychological process.

The old Congress members did virtually nothing to create a new psychology for themselves and then to change that of the people. In fact, the point of view of the leaders did not indicate any real change in their mentality. They always appealed to the British people, the British Parliaments, and the British Cabinet. They addressed themselves to the Government, the rulers. The people had virtually no place in their programme. Is it any wonder, then, that the best of them are still obsessed by a 'slave mentality?' It is not a reproach. It is a fact. They could not give to the people what they did not possess themselves. They could not get rid of the slave mentality unless they changed the process of their thinking. When they say, they ~~are~~ not fit for Self-Government, they speak the truth; when they say the people of India are not fit for Self-Government, they speak only a half-truth. I believe that there is no nation on the face of the earth which is not fit for some sort of Self-Government. Fitness for democratic Self-Government is not acquired by the methods which our Moderate leaders want to apply. Fitness for democratic Self-Government is only developed by the

methods which the new Congress wants to enforce. I call it new in comparison with the Congress before 1919.

To be frank, I am not at all sorry that no 'full Self-Government' was given by the Act of 1919. If it had been so granted, we could not have the intense propaganda of 1920-22. Of course, it could not have been so given ! I am not even sorry that we did not succeed in getting Swaraj by the end of 1921 ; because, if so, we could not have the experience of 1922, which was essential for the development of our Nationhood on proper lines. Personally, I am in no hurry, as I firmly believe that the path we are treading is the right path and that the acquisition of Self-Government or Swaraj is a psychological process. Every thing we are doing, every suffering we are subjected to, every act of repression and suppression helps. What I want is the genuine article and not a spurious, or a counterfeit one.

Looked at in this light, we are even grateful to our Moderate friends for what they have made us go through. I personally have implicit faith in my ideals and in the general policy we are following to attain those ideals. There will be periods of reaction and sometimes stagnation. There will be what apparently may look very like repulses and defeats. Enthusiasm may be followed by indifference ; intense activity by comparative lethargy ;

help by disappointment. But if the idea and the process, the thought and the method, the ideal and the means to achieve it, are laid down on true lines, they will in time fructify. There is no reason for despondency ; there is no room for disappointment. Onward ? Soldiers of Democracy, victory is assuredly yours ! It may come soon, it may come late. Ripen your thoughts, strengthen your beliefs, invigorate your faith ; give it to others, take it from others ; integrate your differences. Create a collective purpose, a collective mind and a collective will and you will win.

CHAPTER VI

THE IMMEDIATE NEED FOR SWARAJ

BUT it is all very well to lay down ideals and principles ; the real difficulty comes when you begin to apply them to the actual conditions of life. Have we a clean slate to write upon ? Can we begin direct, and at once, with a truly democratic state *i.e.*, a democracy in the sense we attach to it ?

Of course, not. The people have to be educated into it and it has to grow. So, from the very nature of our principles and beliefs, it is impossible to manufacture democracy at our beck and call

What then should we do in the meantime ? Should we acquiesce in the continuance of this autocratic, militaristic, bureaucratic regime as the Sydenhams and O'Dwyers advocate until our masses grow into democracy and become fit to enforce their will in the State ? Or should we accept ' Self-Government by dribblet and instalments, as Mr. Montagu proposed to ' give ' it to us ? Is there not force in the contention that once the capitalists, the landlords and the middle classes capture power, it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the masses consisting of the ordinary ryots, the labourer, the small peasant proprietors and the untouchables to come into their own ? Will the

Government of an Indian bureaucracy be more efficient, liberal and progressive than that of the present bureaucracy of British officials? May not the Indian capitalist and the landlord use their freshly acquired powers to keep down the ryot, the small proprietor, the labourer and untouchable? Do not these elements already predominate in the present legislatures? I am afraid it is impossible to give with any certainty a negative answer to these questions.

Why, then, should we be intent upon bringing to an end the present administration? Why not accept the moderates' position and join hands with them in working the reforms? Because, we believe that the continuance of the present system of Government, and any delay in claiming our right to immediate Swaraj, is likely to deepen the slave-psychology we have come to be possessed of; because we believe that once a people on the way to Nationhood become conscious of their degraded political position, any further acquiescence by them in the continuance of it is impossible.

Foreign rule, in any circumstances, is intolerable, because it saps the moral foundation of the subject people. It unfits them for thinking independently; it destroys their self-respect and their power of initiative; it prevents them from expressing themselves freely; it bars all kinds of effective organisation, and fosters habits of dependence. An

administration may be thoroughly efficient, absolutely impartial, and perfectly just (which the present British administration by no means is,) yet withal, because it is a foreign administration, it is un-moral and preventive of a healthy growth of democracy. A nation can afford to have for a time an inefficient administration, but a servile state is fatal to healthy growth of life. An organized and legalized anarchy is worse than an unorganized and spasmodic one. Dyarchy is only another name for absolutism. It is the same bitter pill coated with sugar. As long as the source of power is situated at White Hall, as long as the 'steel frame' must be supplied by Great Britain under compulsion, and not by the free choice of the people of the country, as long as the control of the purse and the control of the military is vested in the foreign Secretary of State, so long, there cannot be even a beginning of the democratic process. We may need friendly guidance, we may welcome friendly advice, but as long as we are ordered from the White Hall, it is impossible for us to feel that we have the freedom to grow to our full stature by our own initiative and on our own model. We must feel that the Government is subject to our will, even though it may, after all, be only a class Government.

An Indian bureaucracy or an Indian legislature composed of the landlord, the capitalists and the middle classes, cannot altogether brush aside the

wishes of the people as the present administration does. It cannot entirely ignore or defy them. It must consult their wishes and be conciliatory. We want our masses to grow in manliness, in frankness, and in power—not by the crooked methods which the present bureaucracy is teaching them, not by learning the alphabets of treachery, cunning and diplomacy, with which they are now being inoculated, but by intelligent self-assertion and by growing consciousness of their ability to enforce their righteous will. We are not at all confident that an Indian bureaucracy will be more efficient, or more impartial, or more conscientious than the present British bureaucracy; but we are confident that while no amount of public opinion can bend the latter, the former will have to bend to the people's will. No Indian bureaucracy would have dared to pass a Rowlatt Act, or to write the report of the majority of the Hunter Committee: or to decide the Punjab affair as the British Cabinet did. No Indian bureaucracy would have committed the blunders of the Guruka Bagh affair. No Indian bureaucracy would have dared to use violence to disperse peaceful volunteers as was done last year. No Indian bureaucracy would have declared the Shiromani Gurdwara Prabhandak Committee and the Akali Dal unlawful associations within the meaning of the Criminal Law Amendment Act.

Government cannot conduct its affairs without

officials. A bureaucracy is distinguished from an ordinary body of officials by its exclusiveness, by its caste-like organization, and by its extraordinary and over-weening idea of prestige. There are permanent officials in Great Britain and in the United States, but you cannot call them a bureaucracy. They do not possess the characteristics of a bureaucracy. Though officials of the Government, they are also members of the Nation. The prestige of the people is of greater importance to them than that of themselves or of the State. They are servants of the people, not their masters. A bureaucrat is a master, a ruler, a Hakim. An official is an Ahlkar, or an Amaldar. As soon as India becomes self-governed, though not fully democratic, the Indian official, however high may be his rank, will know his position. He will be a member of the Nation first, and a servant of the State next.

An India-born official, however, who is a member of the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy, occupies an entirely different, and a very superior position—superior from the point of view of his prestige against and power over the people. No amount of Indian public opinion affects his conduct. He is at times even more arrogant and haughty than his British colleague. He is afraid of losing caste with the latter, and of falling in his estimation and regard. He is also afraid of his promotion and prospects

being affected by the least suspicion of partiality for his country and its people on the part of his British superiors. He can never free his mind from the fear of confidential and secret reports and consultations among the latter. To him the approval of his brother Anglo-Indian bureaucrat, even though of inferior or equal status, matters more than the disapproval of the whole Indian nation. His position is unnatural, unfortunate and demoralising. He has to deny friendships, to disown relatives and to become a worshipper of servility. It follows from this that the complete Indianization of the Services will not make much difference to the nation as long as their enrolment and control, their promotion and preferment are vested in British hands.

What the Nation wants is the power to appoint and dismiss its servants and not merely a change in the personnel of the services. For a long time to come, we may continue to employ British experts in the various departments of our Government. We have (at least we ought to have) no prejudice against the British as such. What we object to is their mastery over us. As a friend, as a comrade, as an ally, even as guide and adviser we may value the Englishman's co-operation, but we do not want his *hukumat*. We must no longer be his subjects. This, in short, is my position as regards the bureaucracy.

As regards the other point, *viz.*, our having Legislatures dominated by the middle classes, I am afraid we cannot defer Self-Government to the day when a full-fledged and perfect democracy may be possible, though we want a full recognition of the right of all classes and sections of the nation (including the ryot, the small proprietor, the labourer, and the untouchables) to form the Government of the country and to hold an honourable place in it. In their present condition of mental and moral growth, with their economic dependence on the wealthy and the middle classes, a Legislature mainly composed of the latter is inevitable. In India, we cannot, by one leap, do better than what nations having universal suffrage are doing in Europe and America.

At present we have two masters, *viz.*, the foreign capitalist and the Indian capitalist. Surely it will be an improvement to get rid of the former. Then we can educate our people to settle with the latter. We shall have to wait for long if we aim at displacing both at once. By that time we may be thoroughly demoralized and have lost even the little self-respect and power of initiative and independent action we still possess.

But that, by no means, implies that we can ignore the existence and interests of this class and ride rough-shod over their sentiments and needs. Once we are free agents in our own house, we can devise

means and methods not only to prevent the class-hatred and class-war that disfigures Europe to-day, but also to protect the interests of the labouring classes in the transitional period. Besides having champions of their cause and advocates of their interests from among the middle classes, they must be represented by men of their own class both in the Legislatures and the Local and Municipal bodies. No one is good enough to rule over others and to look after their interests. The labourer and the ryot must not feel that they owe the protection of their interest to the kindness and benevolence of their masters or employers. Provision will have to be made immediately for their direct representation through men of their own class in the governing bodies of the country. They will have to be educated by willing friends to participate themselves in the government of the country.

CHAPTER VII

THE NEW IDEAL IN ACTION

THE immediate work before us is now one, education and organization. We carried on an extensive and intensive propaganda in 1921, and also did a great deal of construction and organizing, but both were to a certain extent subordinated to the idea of 'Swaraj in one year.' All work was dominated by that one idea, and consequently some of it at least was only transient, temporary and improvised for the occasion.

Under the stress of that idea, much of the construction and the organization we undertook lacked the elements of permanence. It was not characterized by that amount of thought and reasoning which should have been bestowed on it. Most of the thinking was done by one man,—Mahatma Gandhi. Even he moved about the length and breadth of India like a whirlwind. His thinking also partook of the nature of his movements. It was rapid, swift, and dictatorial. It brooked no delays, no doubts, and no hesitation.

Not that he, the thinker, wanted to be dictatorial or resented discussion. Nothing of the kind. Mahatma Gandhi allowed the fullest discussion and the fullest difference of opinion; yet both were

ineffective and often futile; because before either entered the field, the thought had been given out, accepted by the masses and partly acted upon. Not only he himself, but the country had profound faith in the wisdom and soundness of his judgment and action. Consequently few dared to differ from him; and those who did, were soon convinced that it was breaking against a stone-wall to insist on their own ideas.

Yet the loyalty of his lieutenants and co-workers was neither servile nor superficial. It was freely given and fully deserved. The one dominating idea was to let him work out his scheme with the largest and fullest support which the country could give him. In carrying out his scheme, he neither spared himself nor those who had accepted his leadership. If the scheme failed in its immediate objective, the failure was due neither to any slackness of his, nor to any lack of loyalty and support on the part of his co-workers and followers. The wonder is, not that it failed but that it succeeded so largely and so well. It failed, because of circumstances over which he had no control, but which he might have foreseen.

The matter has been discussed at some length elsewhere and need not detain us here. The point that I want to make is that in the whirlwind of 'Swaraj in one year,' we could not devote much thought to our constructive work, and our organi-

zation consequently lacked the elements of a well-thought-out and well-reasoned scheme.

It was, therefore, an act of wisdom on Mahatmaji's part to drop, at least for a time, Civil Disobedience from the Congress programme, after the Bardoli project of mass Civil Disobedience had been given up on account of the tragedy of Chauri Chaura. The decision, however, about Bardoli and the Bardoli resolutions, which were the outcome of it, burst upon a confiding, expectant and hopeful country like a bombshell. The shock was too sudden, cataclysmic and unexpected. It bewildered, and to a certain extent surprised and angered the people. About twenty thousand of the rank and file were in jails. About ten million rupees had been collected. The Provinces had been depleted of most of their prominent workers. The people had kept their heads cool under the greatest provocation given by the Government and its agents. Thousands had suffered cruelties at the hands of the Police and in jails, without any retaliation. All this had been done in the expectation of the Millennium at Bardoli. All of a sudden came the collapse. Disappointment, resentment and anger was bound to follow, as a reaction.

So it was in this mood that the All-India Congress Committee met at Delhi in order to consider the Bardoli resolution. The Delhi resolutions, embodying a very slight change in the decisions arrived at

Bardoli, are the greatest testimony to the influence of Mahatma Gandhi over his countrymen. Any other leader would have been ruthlessly overthrown and his influence completely shattered. The way in which people listened to him and still deferred to his judgment was, in my opinion, Mahatma Gandhi's greatest triumph. The Government and the Moderates thought otherwise. In the mild revolt at Delhi, they saw the beginning of his fall. In the hope of completing it, they prosecuted and imprisoned him. But the picture of Mahatma Gandhi in the dock, pleading guilty to sedition and calmly and coolly demanding the highest punishment sanctioned by the law, brought out the completest revulsion of feeling in his favour. His partial triumph at Delhi, (because such it was, considering the atmosphere in which the Delhi resolutions were adopted) was completed and fulfilled by his trial and punishment. People forgot their resentment and anger at the failure of Bardoli. The thing that touched the deepest chords of their hearts was the picture of the leader "in distress." True he was not distressed. He declared himself in prison "happy as a bird." But the country was distressed.

The decisions at Gaya are the evidence of this, if any were needed. The country is still under the spell of the great trial at Ahmedabad. It is not in a mood to tolerate any change in the programme, which might, even in the smallest degree, betray a

lack of confidence in the great leader's judgment and wisdom. But in their anxiety to stick to the letter of the old programme, they have in a way set aside the wise decisions arrived at Bardoli. The desire to inaugurate Civil Disobedience and to prepare the country for it in the course of 4 months, by a collection of 25 lakhs of rupees and the enrolment of 50 thousand Volunteers, is distinctly opposed to the spirit of the Bardoli resolution. The excitement of prosecutions and imprisonments, the agitation over the trials and sufferings of the political prisoners, combined with other causes (such as the differences between Hindus and Muslims, the Guru-ka-Bagh affair, the situation in the Near East and the lack of leadership) have prevented the country from following the constructive programme laid down at Bardoli. The controversy about entry into Councils has been carried on in a narrow and partisan spirit. Both sides have used or misused the idea of Civil Disobedience for party purposes.

Civil Disobedience, which had been postponed *sine die*, has again been set up on the altar by both sides. The ghost has again been re-called to life, without the least chance of a greater vitality being put into it than was found possible under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. The mistake of fixing a short time for preparation has been repeated. The spectre of Civil Disobedience is again stalking the

land without the least chance of its finding a definite body and shape in the near future. The idea has been revived in order to create enthusiasm, the lack of which has been held responsible for the failure of the constructive programme. The motive underlying it is not pure. It has the appearance of an electioneering cry. The Council question should have been approached and decided on its own merits. It has very little to do with Civil Disobedience. The result is that the leaders and the workers are again excited over it; and there is no inclination to think of the ways and means of carrying out the constructive programme which is the most vital thing needed to-day.

I have, elsewhere, expressed my views on the Council controversy, and I still hold to them. I do not desire to reproduce them here. But what seems most vital and necessary to me is that the best intellect and the best mind of the Congress movement should be devoted to the task of organizing and educating the country. The leaders should have time and opportunity to think and to think logically, closely and deeply. They ought to study the question, in the spirit of seekers after the truth and aspirants for light. They should hold constant consultations and give and take each other's thoughts. The crude thinking and acting of 1921 should be replaced by deep thinking and wise planning. The experience of 1921 to 1922

should be utilized in arriving at decisions. The work of collecting funds and enlisting volunteers is good in its own way, but much success is not likely to attend it unless well-thought-out schemes of organizing the country in the light of the experiences gained in 1921-22, for the purposes and aims of the Congress, have been evolved, first by individual thinking and then by joint deliberations of those, possessed of the necessary mental and moral qualifications.

The habit of thinking and acting in stress of excitement and exertion requires to be replaced, at least at intervals, by co-ordinated and constructive thinking in a calm and cool atmosphere. We are in the most critical period of our national life. Much will depend on how we think and plan now. No one can see far ahead. But we should put forth in the service of our ideal as much of vision (clear, noble and inspiring) as we can command.

The leaders have thus a great responsibility to discharge. Their lead must be clear, well-considered and definite. The lead in thought must be followed by lead in action. There should be no attempt at all to play to the gallery. There should be no half-heartedness and no hesitations about our resolves. The country should be distinctly told what to do. If it is prepared to listen and do it, well and good. If not, our business does not end here; it begins. We should hammer on. The work of educating

the country into our ideas and plans must be carried on actively. The leaders themselves must do the work. The press, the platform and even the pulpit should be used for it. Both tongue and pen ought to be requisitioned.

All legitimate ways allowed by the existing political constitution should be followed. The constitution is not of our making. We do not owe any allegiance to it. But that is no reason why we should not use the opportunity it gives us without becoming slaves or parties to it, and without in any way shocking or infringing our sense of morality. The only two limitations laid down in our creed are that our methods should be legitimate and peaceful. Subject to that, all ways are open to us. Let different groups adopt different methods, so long as their thoughts and their principles are morally true and politically sound. Uniformity of practice is not at all vital. Driven by common springs, guided by common motives, controlled by common impulses, inspired by common purposes, we can evolve a common will by working on different lines and without wasting much time and energy in useless controversies carried on in a spirit of partisanship. A certain amount of controversy is necessary and vital, especially when it concerns the fundamentals; but when the difference is only due to looking at a thing from different angles, without any difference in objects and in methods, it should

not be allowed to stand in the way of combined action.

I have no doubt in my mind that Civil Disobedience should, for the present, be put on one side. Of course, it will remain a part of our programme. It is based on truth, and on a sense of duty. It is fundamentally right. But the time and occasion for it has for the present gone. We must wait for another favourable opportunity to launch it, if it is at all needed.

In the meantime, we must organise and educate ourselves in a constructive spirit and in an atmosphere of sustained work. The experiences gained and the spirit engendered should both be invoked to help us in the task. I am perfectly certain that if we undertake the work in the same spirit of devotion, of single-mindedness, of sacrifice, and selflessness, as marked our conduct in 1921, the response by the country will be greater, nobler, more inspiring and more durable even than that of former days. Let us make note of the advance we have made and use it for further progress, in the true spirit of pioneers. Let us take our inspiration from the Gita, and act in the living present without nothing for reward, with a will to achieve and succeed. God willing, we shall succeed.

CHAPTER VIII

THE GREATNESS OF THE INDIAN PROBLEM

THE Indian problem is a very vast and complicated problem,—vaster, bigger, and more complicated perhaps than any known to history. Its highness, vastness and complexity are not quantitative only. They are also due to the variety and diversity of interests involved. In population, India is equal to the whole of Europe, minus Russia. In area, it is about $\frac{2}{3}$ rds of the United States of America. In population, it is the second most thickly populated country in the world.

India's history goes back to pre-historic times. Its culture is so ancient as to baffle the researches of the best of antiquarians. No one can fix its beginning. No one can trace its growth even with anything like certainty and confidence. Among its vast population, it claims the representatives of all the races and religions of the world. Its peoples speak many languages and follow many creeds. They belong to different degrees of civilization. Yet no one can deny that it has a geographical, a cultural, and a historical unity of its own, which distinguishes it markedly from other countries and nations of the world. Its national and political

unity, however, is denied by some, and affirmed by others.

Among the former we count the British Imperialists and their foreign admirers. Among the latter are the Indian Nationalists. Motives apart, there is truth in both the statements. The question is relatively new. It has come into more or less prominence within the last fifty, or at the most hundred years. Before that no one even thought of it. All history, ancient or modern, speaks of India 'as India', never of its parts. All references in foreign literature indicate this unity. The 'Nation' idea itself is comparatively a new idea. It is a product and growth of the nineteenth century. Before that, it may have been nebulous or latent, but no one ever attached any importance to it. In India, it has come into prominence on account of the claim set up for India's freedom or independence, by Indians, or their friends in the British Isles or elsewhere. It has thus become an issue between the Imperialists and the Nationalists. The former are interested in exaggerating the diversity of races, languages, religions and cultures which characterize it, and the latter in minimising them. What matters is the motive behind, and the point of view from which the question is approached.

The tests of nationhood or nationality relied on by the early nineteenth century Sociologists, have all, one by one, been dropped by twentieth century

thinkers, for the simple but most cogent reason that they do not fit in with the facts of life. Judged by those old standards and tests, there are few nations on the face of the globe which can be passed as such; yet no one in his senses will deny the title to peoples and nations who claim it, in spite of the lack of those tests. The whole world concedes that title for all practical purposes. The subject is admirably discussed in Mr. Zangwill's short but brilliant essay on Nationality published by Messrs. Macmillan & Co., New York. I have no intention of examining it here.

I will assume that, this diversity notwithstanding, there is sufficient unity in India to entitle us to call ourselves a nation and claim the privileges of nationhood. But even granting that we are not a nation yet, it is sufficient for our purposes that all the peoples inhabiting India have a genuine desire to become a nation, and aim at the full status and privileges of nationhood. Of this desire and this aim there can be no doubt. All the different religious communities of India, Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, Parsis, Jains, Buddhists, all parties of the Indian politicians, Moderates, Extremists, Non-co-operators and Revolutionaries, all classes of the Indian people, lords and tenants, capitalists and workmen, Brahmans and Non-Brahmans, are agreed on the desirability and necessity of building themselves up into a united nation and

achieving "Swarajya." They may differ, and do differ, as to methods; as to the pace of progress in that direction; as to the means of achieving that end. But there is no difference as to the aim and object. Even the Anglo-Indians agree with the Nationalists on this point. National unity is one of the basic objects of the Indian National Congress. Both the Moderates and the Non-co-operators are pledged to it. The Non-co-operators have laid great emphasis on this part of their programme, and however much our enemies may ridicule the statement that Hindu-Muslim unity has been achieved, there is no doubt that considerable success has attended our efforts in that line within the last two years.

Recently much has happened to strengthen the statement of our enemies that Hindus and Muslims are more bitter in their feelings towards one another than before. But I am still hopeful. The Hindu-Muslim problem is a creation of the British Raj. In the Hindu period of India's long and eventful history, there were no Muslims in this country, and consequently there could be no such problem. In the Muslim period too, the problem as we now see it did not exist. The fact of the ruling dynasty being Muslim, gave an advantage to the Muslims over the Hindus, a circumstance in which the latter had to acquiesce. But the bane of Muslim rule in India was not so much the tyranny over Hindus, as

the existence of a state of never-ceasing war. Yet there were periods of Muslim rule in which the country was prosperous and flourishing. There were only a few reigns in which the Hindus were discriminated against or persecuted for their religion.

With English rule in India, came the Hindu-Muslim problem. Now it is extending. The problem of India is no more a Hindu-Muslim problem only. It is becoming a Hindu-Muslim-Christian-Sikh-Parsi-Buddhist-Jain problem. Never before has communal consciousness been so keen, so assertive, nay, so aggressive as within the last fifty years of British rule. The reasons are obvious. British rule has created, fostered, and nourished it. The genius of European civilization has encouraged it. Education in European ideals and standard first give birth to that intense individualism which teaches "every one for himself." Unsatisfied individual ambition plus patriotic bias, plus religious nationalism, plus economic needs did the rest. Communal rivalry between Hindus and Muslims for Government favours was first brought into existence by Lord Dufferin and Sir Auckland Colvin. The little spark which was then kindled as an effective counter-move against the Indian National Congress, and as an antidote against growing Indian Nationhood has since been fed by different agencies, in different ways and with different motives. It

has now grown into a flame, which is less of a danger to Indian Nationhood than to the British domination of Asia.

The British are a very queer people. They have a reputation for being unimaginative, and are rather proud of their Imperialistic instincts. Crooked Imperialism, however, always lands its votaries into awkward positions. The present loyalty of the class-conscious Muslim has now taken a different turn. From a check to the Indian Nationalist, from a hindrance in the way of Indian Nationhood, from a clog in the wheels of the Indian National Congress, it has developed into an ally of the former and an asset of very high value for the latter. The British have recently knighted a Muslim poet than whom no one has done more to fire the ambition of the class-conscious Muslim to regain their lost political dominance in Asia. Similar is the result of British policy towards the Sikhs. The Akali movement is a natural child of Imperial crookedness. This is, however, by the way. The important fact to be noted is that in spite of this communal consciousness being just now at its highest point, the desire for national unity and for political freedom has grown along with it and within the last five years has burst out into a blaze threatening discomfiture and destruction to all those who stand in the way of its progress. It is remarkable that, while the communal consciousness of the

different religious communities forming the Indian Nation is being fed and fostered by all methods open to human ingenuity, nothing avails against the growth of the idea of common Nationhood.

The rapidity with which the latter is gaining strength, both extensively and intensively, is marvellous. Several circumstances have combined to bring about this result, not the least noticeable of which is the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. While the Moderates have been making frantic efforts to get Under-Secretaryships, Governorships, Executive Councillorships, and Ministerships, the Non-co-operators, 'under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, have been busy in fostering and spreading the idea of Nationhood. Thousands of tongues and thousands of pens have delivered the message of unity, national solidarity and national independence—political, economic and cultural—at every home and hearth in the length and breadth of this ancient land. I firmly believe that there is hardly a cottage in India where the name and fame of Mahatma Gandhi has not penetrated and where his message has not been delivered. I have received many evidences of this.

It is therefore no exaggeration to say that, whatever may be said of the failure of the Non-co-operation movement to achieve Swarajya within one year, its success in fostering and spreading the idea of Nationhood, in creating an intense desire for

national freedom, and in creating a collective will to achieve this by our own effort, has been monumental

The first phase of the movement was over with the Bardoli resolutions and the subsequent imprisonment of Mahatmajī. Now that we have gone through the first fire, and to my mind, successfully, without undue injury to either our body or soul, it behoves us to examine the situation calmly and dispassionately, take stock of our losses and gains, and chalk out a programme for future work with intelligence, born of experience and reflection, with determination, born of the conviction of the righteousness of our cause, and with a recollection of sufferings which have been bravely endured on its behalf.

CHAPTER IX

THE DIRECT AIM IN VIEW

It is necessary that we should be clear in our thought, because consistency of action is impossible without clarity of mental vision. What is our aim? What is our goal? Nationhood and Swarajya? Yes. But what do we mean by either or both? A patched up unity and a patched up Swarajya, or a real biological unity incorporating all of us into one single whole, with a determination to be and remain a whole for all time to come? Our critics say that our present unity is a mere lip-unity, or at best a mechanical one, with the sole object of turning out the British, so that after the British have cleared out, we may be free to fight out our battles in this land of many religions and many languages.

Do we want a collection of mutually warring, struggling, competing religious communities with chances of victory or domination for whosoever turns out to be the strongest, the most efficient and the most powerful? Shall these streams flow separately, each in its own bed, along-side of each other, but without the one mixing its waters with the other and without all of us becoming one complete whole,—to unite against a common enemy

whenever there is one to fight, but otherwise to remain isolated, each one of us trying to devour and absorb the other whenever there is an opportunity to do so? Is that our conception of Unity? Or are we arriving at a complete obliteration of all religious differences?

Is that possible? Is that desirable? Shall we not be poorer for it? Do not these different points of view constitute our inheritance? Are they not our wealth? Do they not distinguish us from the rest of this world? Is it for nothing that the world thinks that of all the peoples of the world, Indians more than any others are truly religious? Is it for nothing that we have earned the distinction of being a nation of philosophers, in which every man, woman and child cares more for the ultimate and the permanent than for the temporary and the transient? Is it for nothing that the world gives us credit for plain living and high thinking? Are we ashamed of the fact that ours is a country of many faiths and many cultures? Is it impossible for us to win national freedom and be great in the comity of nations, without losing this distinction? If so, let us once for all come to the conclusion that our task is an impossible one; for I can think of no time and no contingency when this country will cease to be a land of many faiths, many beliefs and many creeds. What possibility is there of this country ever abolishing its religious

differences or being the home of a people following only one religion? At present there is no religion, no faith, no philosophy, no form of worship which is not represented here, and which does not claim votaries, followers and adherents among its vast population. Is there a single district, not to speak of provinces, which is religiously homogeneous? Is it religious homogeneity which we are aiming at? I hope not. I believe not. I, for one, not only believe that the task is impossible, but also consider it to be undesirable. Such an aim will be unworthy of our past and one that might also bring into question our sanity.

What then is our conception of nationhood? What do we mean by Hindu-Muslim unity? The expression Hindu-Muslim unity is symbolic. It is not exclusive, but inclusive. When we speak of Hindu-Muslim unity, we do not exclude the other religious communities, like the Sikhs, the Christians the Parsis, the Buddhists and the Jains from our conception.

The Indian Nation, such as it is, or such as we intend to build it, neither is nor will be exclusively Hindu, Muslim, Sikh or Christian. It will be for each and all. That is my ideal of Swarajya. That is my goal of nationhood.

But it does not mean that until we attain this goal, we must remain a subject nation. There may be some Indians who think that it is an impossible

goal. I am not one of them. Yet it cannot be denied that it is a very difficult problem. Let us not set to work at it light-heartedly, in a careless way, without deep searchings of heart and without that robustness and virility of faith which alone can make the impossible, possible. Mere optimism will not be enough. Besides optimism, we require a thorough understanding of the problem, in all its bearings and implications, full appreciation of the difficulties and obstacles in the way, without any inclination either to under-estimate or to exaggerate them, a clear grasp of the process or processes, by which we are likely to achieve our object and a vivid idea of the risks involved and the disappointments that are likely to face us, before we reach the final goal.

But that is not the only point on which we need clear thinking. Unity may be an end by itself, in as much as it is absolutely necessary for national freedom. But after all, it is a means to a greater and more comprehensive end which is freedom, liberty, independence or Swarajya. What is our conception of freedom? What kind of independence are we seeking? What do we mean by Swarajya? What is our ideal and how do we propose to achieve it? By war, rebellion, revolution, non-co-operation, or agitation? Do we want to get out of the British Empire, or stay in it? Must we break with the British? Or is it possible to achieve our

end without breaking with them? Are the British enemies or friends? What are the weapons with which we propose to fight? Is our campaign one of hatred, or love, or neither, or both? Can we reach the goal, or attain the ideal, by one jump? Or must we proceed by stages? If the latter, what kind of stages shall we be content with?

These are some of the questions which thrust themselves into the mentality of every thinking Indian, making his days anxious and his nights sleepless.

Some of them need not be answered at once. But there are others which brook no delay and are insistently clamouring for an immediate reply. Because on their right answer depends our programme of work. The desire for Swarajya has become universal. It embraces all classes and all sections of the Indian population. People are prepared to make great sacrifices and even suffer for it, if need be. But they are not clear as to its meaning and implications. We have inspired, say some critics, the spirit of the nation for Swarajya, without making clear what it is likely to bring to them. These friends maintain that our ideas of Swarajya are so hazy, vague and nebulous, that we dare not put a scheme before the public for fear of rousing sleeping dogs and creating differences. The charge is partly true and partly false.

CHAPTER X

THE NEED OF SELF-DETERMINATION

WE are not in a position to prepare a complete scheme of Swarajya now, because the term is only relative and not absolute. What kind of Swarajya will suit us at a particular time depends on the time and manner of attaining it, on our capacity and ability to put our ideas into practice ; on the mental and moral development of the nation ; and no less on the world situation. The Swarajya of 1930 must, from the nature of things, be different from the Swarajya of 1923. It would be foolish for us to put forth an authoritative scheme before the time and the nation are ripe for it. The reforms which the Congress demanded in 1916 proved to be entirely inadequate in 1918. Instead of furthering the cause of Swarajya, they actually hampered it. There will be plenty of time to make a scheme after we have secured the right to make one. As soon as that right is conceded, we shall set ourselves to make a scheme, such as we think can be enforced at once or in the near future. In the meantime what we can and ought to do is to declare our principles and start educating people in them.

At present, it seems that there are very few people in the country who have studied the science of

social and political psychology or who are acquainted with the advanced political thought of the world. There are fewer still, perhaps, who have devoted much thought to our own national psychology and how we can or ought to change it with a view to put our principles into practice. The Moderate Party which guided and controlled the Indian National Congress before 1919, is practically pledged to representative institutions of the kind that are prevailing in Great Britain. They believe in "majority rule." One of the greatest disadvantages of the position of political dependence such as we are in, is that, willy-nilly, we have to accept institutions which our rulers thrust on us. We are thus, sometimes, forced to put on the discarded clothes of the world.

We can see this most vividly in the department of Education. We are following methods and principles beyond which Europe and America have already much advanced. The theory is that we must pass through the stages through which other nations have passed to reach the position or advantage which they are occupying to-day. We are often told that even in Great Britain, political progress was not so rapid as we desire it to be.

There is a fallacy underlying this statement which the Jingo opponents of our rights ignore. They are correct if they mean that democratic institutions must grow and the pace must not be forced. But

they are entirely wrong, if they mean that democracy should grow by methods and in shapes which the experience of the other parts of the world has declared to be wrong, harmful and undemocratic.

Moreover, they ignore that there is a direct incitement to violence in this criticism of theirs. Must we go through revolutions of the kind through which Britain has passed in order to get to democracy? Has the world's experience nothing to teach us, even if our rulers do not propose to learn anything from it? Perhaps it does not matter much, if we get Swarajya to-day or in five years. But it does matter that our development into Swarajya and our preparation for it should be on right lines and not on lines which have been discarded by the rest of the world, or which, after being tried for over a century, have been found to be defective and wasteful.

I will give an illustration. Europe and America have discovered that their system of education was more mechanical than organic, more wasteful, individualistic and competitive than practical, useful and co-operative. What is the aim of education? A recent writer has said that "the object of education is to fit children into the life of the community. Every co-operative method conceivable, therefore, must be used in our schools for the end. It is at school that children begin to learn group-initiative, group-responsibility—in other

words, social functioning. . . . Every child must be shown his place in the life that builds and his relation to all others who are building . . . *Individual competition must, of course, disappear.* All must see that the test of success is ability to work with others, not to surpass others." (The italics are mine.)

Consciously or unconsciously, the principle is being enforced and put into practice in different countries in different ways. But here we are, glorying in methods which modern thought on the subject has long discredited and discounted. Familiar from personal experience with the educational experiments in the United States, and comparing them with the educational methods followed in the British Isles, and in India, I can say that, while the United States are twenty-five years ahead of the British Isles, the latter are twenty-five years, or even perhaps fifty years ahead of India.

Another eminent publicist has said that the chief function of education is to teach the child to think and to act and not to repeat from memory the thoughts of others. Is there any reason that we, in India, should make the same mistakes which Europe made before it discovered these truths? Why cannot we follow the truth at once? Yet our lords and masters insist that we must go through the same mill, no matter how much waste of human energy, human powers and human welfare might be involved therein.

Let us take another illustration. The best modern thought is crying out that the existence of big landlords holding large areas of land for purposes of profit and income is not good for any society ; that they are like mill-stones hanging round the neck of the nation ; that somehow, or other, land should be freed from the grip of the landlord and made available for cultivation by and use of those who want to use it for the benefit of the whole society. Yet, our Government is still actually engaged in creating big landlords. I am not speaking of landlords that have inherited lands or bought them in the past. I am referring to the action of the Government in giving, or selling big areas of land to persons who are capitalists, pure and simple. This can only be explained on the theory that those who are thus acting, do not care for the future ; that they look only to the present. So long as they can get large sums of money for immediate use, or can increase the revenues of their Government in order to pay higher salaries to themselves and others, it matters little to them what difficulties they are accumulating for the future democracy of India. Live for the present, and let the Devil take care of the future, is their motto.

Similarly, they are sowing thorns in numerous other ways. The whole judicial system of British India, of which they are so proud, is rotten. It is

opposed to the best interests of society. I cannot continue this theme in detail and point out in how many ways we are already falling behind the times. What I want to impress on my countrymen is that, while we are not free to frame a detailed scheme of Swarajya until we are free to put it into operation, we ought to state our principles and ideals and start discussing, analyzing and synthesizing them, so that we may be ready for the task when we are in a position to undertake it. Our first business is to educate people into right ideas and offer them opportunities for study and discussion. Our second duty will be to prepare the ground for carrying out, when the time comes, such of them as may be adopted by the collective will of the Nation.

The Nation we aim to build will also depend on our ideals. We must be clear as to what we eventually want to grow into. Is the British State or the American State or the French State our ideal? Must we necessarily imitate Europe at all? Have we nothing of our own to contribute to the constitution of the world? The present day Europe is sick of its national hates. It consists of warring classes, warring communities and warring States. This is the natural result of the social philosophy it has been following for the last two hundred years. It dominates the world in all departments of the world's life; it controls the markets of the globe, and decides the fate of peoples older and more

spiritual than itself, yet its adherents at the present moment are extremely unhappy. They do not know what is going to happen next year or the year after that.

In its desire to keep India under its thumb, Great Britain is forcing its material thought, and with it, its own system upon us. We are great admirers of British character, of British literature, and may be of certain phases of British social life ; but we cannot consider its political institutions to be the last word, or even the best word, in political philosophy or political life. Great Britain, and for the matter of that, the whole of Europe, can be likened only to the crest of an active volcano. A revolution may break out there any day, and when it erupts, it will involve the whole world. It may take 10 or 25 or 50 years to come, but come it will, unless the European nations change the nature of their Governments, and the character of their democracies in the meantime.

The best and the greatest of European thinkers are dissatisfied with things as they are. 'Dissatisfied' is perhaps a very mild expression. We might have said 'disgusted.' The whole social thought of Europe is undergoing a silent but a sure change. There cannot be any doubt that capitalism in its present form is doomed, and with it are doomed the capitalistic forms of Government. Whether this change will come peaceably, or after cataclysmic

conflicts, like those of Russia, no one can foretell.

In these circumstances, shall we be wise in copying British models and in introducing British institutions almost in their entirety? Yet it is exactly what is happening. There are not any among the Indian publicists who aim at Bolshevik ideals or Bolshevik methods. But there can be no doubt that unadulterated and unrelated capitalism and imperialism of the kind which prevail in Europe, and which are being thrust on us against our will, lead directly to Bolshevism. For Bolshevism is a reaction against this kind of social and economic life which the west has found so empty, futile and vain.

We, in India, have never followed the European economic ideals and it is not to our interest to adopt them. What would we not give to keep India free from that class war which is raging so furiously in Europe and which is threatening its peace and prosperity so imminently!

But we are helpless to do anything in the matter. The choice offered to us is between the irresponsible 'absolute,' autocratic rule of the British bureaucracy, or the hybrid system of Council Government which has been brought into existence by the Act of 1919 with its immense capitalistic preponderance. We have pronounced against both, and we refuse to have either. What we want is

freedom to live our own life, to mould our own institutions, and to build our own future democracy in our own way. It may be that we shall make mistakes ; but no mistake can be more disastrous than the certain class war to which we are being led by the hand, at the present time.

Therefore, I think it is our duty to declare plainly that the form of representative Government which prevails in Great Britain, is not our goal ; that the European form of democracy which prevails in capitalist England is not our ideal ; and that we should infinitely rather be saved from the economic life and ideals of Europe than become rich by adopting them.

We want a democracy that will include all the peoples of India, and recognise no masters and slaves, no capitalists and wage-earners and a demarcation of governed and governing classes. We want a democracy in which all will be brothers and co-workers. This does not necessarily mean the abolition of property, or that there will be no rich and no poor in the future Indian democracy that we aim at. Rich and poor are comparative terms. There may be some rich and some poor in a democracy without the evils of a capitalistic society like that under the load of which modern Europe is groaning.

These things which I have put down are but stray thoughts and ideals ; they have come to me out of the mist of the awakening to a new life in India that

has dawned with the Non-co-operation movement. The difficulty of the present foreign rule is that our wishes are being denied a place in our becoming what we want. Constitutions are being made for us in England and we are told that it is the will of British Parliament that must prevail ; that we must agree to being made or unmade by the British Parliament,—nay, that we must even be happy over it and sing hallelujahs in honour of our benefactors. The Non-co-operation movement is a protest against this stupid and arrogant assumption of divine powers on the part of a people which has become immersed in gross materialism, like England at the present time, and cannot even take care of its own poor and unemployed.

If the British Government were sincerely anxious to help us to a state of ‘Self-Government,’ then the best, the wisest, and the most practical thing for it to do would be to leave us free to organize our own Government in our own indigenous way.

APPENDIX I

A. B. C. OF INDIAN POLITICS

IN the days of the agitation against the partition of Bengal, a Bengali Lawyer (now a knighted and pensioned judge of the High Court of Calcutta) remarked that a subject nation has no politics. What he meant was that the politics of a subject nation was entirely different from that of the free nation. In a free nation, the politicians use the constitution for the purpose of reforming and improving the political machinery, so as to bring it in full and better accord with the will of the nation, to make it more efficient, more democratic, and more representative of the constituent wills of the nation. In a free nation, a reactionary politician has his uses. He serves the purpose of a brake or Moderator. The politicians of a free nation may aptly be divided into Radicals, Liberals and Conservatives; into evolutionaries and revolutionaries; into Democrats and anti-democrats; into Royalists and Republicans and so forth. The politics of a free nation assumes its sovereign nature and its right to deal with other nations on terms of equality and friendship. This is not and cannot be true of a subject people. Firstly, a subject people are not a "nation" in the true sense of the term. As long as a people are not free, they are not a political entity with which nations can deal on terms of reciprocation. They have no will which they can enforce or execute. They are a mere mass of heterogeneous elements, which can be or are

used by their masters for their purposes. These masters may be good or kindly people, they may be inclined to be 'benevolent' or exacting, but they are masters all the time. A subject people have no corporate will, because if they had one, they would not be subject, nor have they a free will, because, if they had one, they would have the power to enforce it.

A free nation has a state, which is responsible to the nation. The nation can change the state, can limit its powers, define its responsibilities and bend it to its will. This is not true of a subject people. The very fact of their subjection takes them out of the category of live political units. A Government is only an organ of the state.

A free nation can change its government at will. That is its freedom. The politicians of a free country can take care of the liberties of the people; but in the subject country the subjects have no liberties, because the state which is absolutely independent of the people owes no responsibilities to the latter except such as are of its own making and admission, that is, self-imposed. These latter may be called concessions, gifts or boons, but they do not amount to liabilities, or responsibilities and have no binding force. Even among the free nations, the idea of the responsible state is a new one, which is not yet fully developed in all its bearings. In some countries it is denied in theory, though there is hardly a state in Europe and America where it is not accepted in practice. Even sovereign states are subject to the sovereignty of the nations. There the people can talk of their fundamental rights, of their fundamental liberties. In a subject country the people have no rights or liberties. They have only duties, which have been imposed upon them by the will of the state, which

is a power exterior to and independent of them. In a responsible state, the laws are the commands of the nation expressed and promulgated in ways and means sanctioned by the nation. In the case of a subject nation the so-called laws are the commands of the rulers, expressed and promulgated by them at their will. It is a misnomer to call them laws. They may be laws in the Austinian sense of the term. But the world has changed since Austin wrote and the conception of law has also changed. A law is now the wish or will of the sovereign nation expressed and promulgated in ways sanctioned or approved by it. Even the sovereign "nation" cannot abrogate certain natural rights of the individual and where it does, the individual has a right to disregard the will of the nation so abrogating its "inalienable and imprescribable rights". But, surely, where the nation has no will, or is by virtue of its subjection incapable of expressing its will, or where its politics are controlled, dominated and governed by an exterior power, there is no such thing as "law" in the real sense of the term. According to the old theory,* the nation has a distinct personality from that of the individuals who compose it.

It has thus a will naturally superior to the will of its constituent individuals, simply because the collective person is superior to the individual person. This superiority consists in what we call public service or sovereignty. The nation is organised. It has built a government to represent it. That government acts as the agent of the national volition. It thus exercises in the name of the nation a sovereignty of which it cannot be deprived. The state is thus the sovereign nation organised as a government and situated on a definite territory. The state as the organised nation is thus the

* See "Law in the Modern State" by Leon Duguit Introduction.

subject of sovereignty and the public power gives to it the right to exercise a subjective law. Its commands are the exercise of this law.

Its members are at once citizens and subjects. As a part of the national collectivity which exercises sovereignty they are citizens, but since they are subordinated to a government exercising sovereignty in the name of the nation, they are also subjects. Constitutional law is thus that mass of relations dealing, first with the organisation of the state and second, with the relation of the state to its members. We have thus two unequal subjects of law—the superior juristic person called the state, and the inferior individuals called the subjects. But the subjection right of the state is opposed to the sovereign right of the individual. The latter is a natural right, inalienable and imprescribable.

“It belongs to the individual by virtue of his humanity. It is a right anterior, even superior, to that of the state. Clearly, therefore, the first rule of constitutional law obliges the state to organise itself so as to secure the maximum protection of individual rights to every human being”.

This was the theory of the 19th century. In the realm of theory it still holds the field. But the present evolution has been summarised by the French jurist whom I have quoted above.

“The ruling class has no subjective sovereignty. It has a power which it exerts in return for the organisation of those public services which are consistently to respond to the public need. Its acts have neither force, nor legal value save as they contribute to this end”.

“Constituent law is no longer a mass of rules applying to superior and subordinate, to a power that can command and a subject that must obey. All wills are individual wills; all are of equal validity; there is no

hierarchy of wills; the measure of their difference is determined by the end they must pursue. . . . So it is that the idea of service replaces the idea of sovereignty. The state is no longer a sovereign power issuing its commands. The idea of public service lies at the root of the theory of the modern state."

The tendency of recent thought is to dispute the absolute sovereignty of the state, to deny its subjective rights, to emphasise its objective duties and to hold that the authority of law is independent of the state and that "the state is beneath the law; for, by its very definition it is an instrument, not an end." It is clear to an unsophisticated mind that in the political sphere there is no such thing as an Indian nation or an Indian state. The nation whose will counts, is the British, the state which actually rules and the government that functions is that of Great Britain. There is no such thing in India as government established by its law. The government of India is at best only an agency of the British Government. In the words of Lord Curzon, it is a subordinate department of the British Government. The Reform act of 1919 has made no change in its status! In fact, by its very preamble and defining clause it has emphasised its subordinate nature and its derivative authority. By no fiction can it be postulated that the Indian people are a part of the British nation and citizens of the British State or the British Empire—not even in the sense in which the black inhabitants of Senigambia are citizens of the French Republic. The inhabitants of French colonies and French dependencies are more or less French citizens, because they have a right of representation in the French State. The Indians, however, have no such right.

The Reform Act has done nothing more than created

in India a department of the British State to which the latter has delegated certain of its powers subject to right of revision and recall. The Reform Act may at any minute be recalled by the British State without any reference to the people of India, or it may be revised by them in such a way as to take away the little it has conceded to them. Even as it is, its veto is absolute and complete.

The fact that India is one of the original signatories to the Covenant of the League of Nations, that its representatives' have been admitted into the councils of the Empire on terms of equality, that an Indian was nominated as a member at the British delegation to the Washington Conference, may tickle the vanity of those who see in these arrangements means of personal glory and aggrandisement, but it does not make the slightest difference in the real status of India as a subject country. India cannot be free by its memberships of the League of Nations, or by its representation at the Washington Conference. It will be free only when its people are in a position to make its government function in accordance with their will. Even ten thousand 'Rt. Hon'bles' cannot bring about its freedom, much less bring any glory to it, as long as the Indian people do not constitute themselves into a sovereign nation and thereby bring into existence a state which will look for its authority to the Indian nation. Mr. Sastri has pronounced his benediction on the policy of repression which has resulted in Mr. Gandhi's imprisonment. Does Mr. Sastri realize what that benediction implies and connotes? It betrays a deplorable ignorance of the constructive side of politics; it shows a confused intellect. He and those who think with him justify all this interference with the liberty of the press, of speech

and of meeting on the part of the Government of India on the ground that the first and foremost duty of every Government is to maintain "law and order". The doctrine is as pernicious and mischievous as it is antiquated and out of tune with modern conditions of life. I have pointed out above that there is no such thing as Indian "law" in the real and modern sense of the term. There is certainly English Law which has been imposed upon us by our rulers. Morally and legally (*i.e.* according to law in the abstract as expounded by the latest and most enlightened authorities), we owe no allegiance to that law, though according to British made statute law we do. Our allegiance only comes from the irresistible power of the Government and the powerlessness of the Indian people. The British have conquered us. They have conquered us by our help—by our men and money—that is perfectly true; but all the same, they owe their power to the fact of conquest. According to the ideas of morality, the conquest gives them the right to impose their rule and their laws on us. Willingly or unwillingly we must submit to their rule and their laws as long as we do not come into the possession of such power as will force them to restore our liberties to us. Our first and foremost duty, then, is to find out the key to that power. In the meantime, they must exercise their right of might and rule us to their best advantage. The British say: "Prove that you are fit to govern yourself and we shall retire". The statement may not be sincere, but it is perfectly true. The moment the Indian people prove to the English that they are fit to rule themselves, the English will concede their right to them. But fitness for self-government will come only from power. The measure of our power to impose our will on

them will be the proof of our fitness. The duty of every Indian patriot, then, consists in educating his people to formulate their will and to acquire the training, the discipline and the power of imposing it on their foreign masters. The logic of the British Imperialist is sufficiently clear. He wants to gather the harvest he has sown and to take as much advantage of our helplessness as he can. Some, comparatively a very small number, have acquired the consciousness that it is a bad business, immoral, and harmful in the long run—harmful even to the nation—and that it must be ended. Their number, however, is so small that their voice counts for nothing—they are only Little Englanders. The vast bulk of the British nation, Tory, Liberal, Labour, Nationalist and Internationalist, is Imperialistic to the core. Arguments and ideas do not impress them. Political morality they have none, except such as suits their imperial aims. Appeals to their sense of justice, fair play and humanity are absolutely useless. Of course, there are Britishers that have their own characteristics. Some are soft, others hard. Some have the mailed fist; others, the kid glove. Some are brutally frank; others are magnificently benevolent. Some prefer to brandish the keen-edged metal; others the keen-edged tongue. Some prefer to rule by the pen; others by the sword. Some are genuinely Liberal, Labourite or Socialist. They are prepared to go far enough, but the moment you question their final supremacy, they change colour and forget all political principles.

They are awfully clever and past masters in the art of cant. They mean what they say, but you do not understand them. The political terms they use have meanings quite different from those in ordinary dictionaries. When they make any political promises, or give

any political pledges, they are quite sincere, but they are not bound by them. Firstly, all political promises and pledges are variable by circumstances. Secondly, their interpretation rests with them. Thirdly, they can easily explain to you that it is to your advantage and to your interest that they should not fulfil their promises or carry out their pledges. Their intentions are always benevolent. They exist and exert themselves only for the benefit of humanity and advance of civilization. When cornered, they bring in the theory of trust. They are trustees and in the discharge of their trust they must remain in possession of your country and have full control over your purse. They must supply your poor people with cheap goods. No one understood them better than Charles Stewart Parnell. Parnell's biographer has in one place explained what the great Irish leader thought of the English. He says:

"He (Parnell) regarded the moral sermons preached by the English statesmen and publicists as the merest cant. Morality was the last thing the English thought of in their dealings with Ireland. . . . There are men who can readily argue themselves into the belief that whatever serves this purpose is moral."

Speaking of English parties, Parnell remarked in one of his speeches.—

"I have always endeavoured to teach my countrymen, whether at home or abroad, the lesson of self-reliance. I do not depend upon English political parties. I should advise you not to depend upon any such party. I do not depend upon good wishes of any section of the English. . . . I have never known any important section of any country, who have assumed the Government of another country, to awaken to the real necessities of the position until compelled to do so."

These sentiments were repeated by him on more than one occasion. Events have justified his opinions. What was true in the case of Ireland—a country of white Christians, is even truer in the case of India. For any Indian nationalist to build any hopes on the English sense of justice, or on English promises and pledges, or on English morality, is the merest moonshine and pure delusion. The lessons of English History are writ large on the map of the world. Any reliance upon the English for our emancipation is, therefore, out of the question. Let us once for all understand that there is no use in deceiving ourselves.

Not that the characteristics of the British people belong to them alone. All empire-building peoples have and must have them, to a greater or less extent.

All these declarations or pronouncements about responsible government by instalments or by stages are mere camouflage. You can be slaves by degrees, but you cannot be free by degrees. The idea is absurd. Let us frankly face the situation. We are slaves, we want to be free. In order to be free, we must have compelling force behind us. It need not be physical force. To think of physical force in the existing conditions and circumstances is folly. The force we want to generate is the force of national will. We must form, guide and control the national will in such a way as to make it irresistible. In this task we can expect no help from the British. We all have to do our work ourselves, in our own way. It would be foolish to seek the help of the British for this end, or to rely on their help. It is not to their interest to help us in gaining power and they never do a thing which is not to their interest—Why should they? We should be prepared for the bitterest opposition from them. In opposing the formation, the

expression and the assertion of our national will, they will use all the means and the power at their disposal to thwart us, to crush us and to convince us of our 'folly.' They will use all the forces of their 'law.' But over and above that, they will even use violence and have recourse to all the powers they possess regardless of legal forms. Above all, they will divide us and use our own people against us. They will appeal to the self-interest of the big landlords, the big bankers, the big lawyers, the big manufacturers and the big officials among us and seek their co-operation for crushing the national will. They will make frantic appeals to our 'patriotism' and to our 'moderation' also. Yes, they will invoke the very name of our country in order to induce us to desist from what they call our 'folly', 'madness' and even 'treachery'.

Patriots they will denounce as traitors, and the latter they will honour as patriots. And the worst is that they will succeed (in fact, they have already succeeded) in winning over a good many of our patriots and publicists to their side. Remember the best, the ablest and the most cunning among us are no match for them. They know these arts to perfection. They have practised them for centuries and for generations. The ablest and the cleverest among us are mere children in politics in their presence. We are no match for them in argument, in dissimulation, in diplomacy, in tactics, in political strategy and in negotiations. The first and the foremost duty of an Indian patriot is to keep at a distance from them, to cultivate the strength of will necessary to resist the tempter within and without, to keep his record clean and to refuse all preferment, privileges and places which they offer. It is no honour to join the foreign rulers of one's country to strengthen their rule, to maintain and enhance their prestige, to become the instruments

of their will to degrade and exploit ourselves. The honours they confer on us and the places and the privileges they bestow are the price of our shame and the evidence of our subjection. There is no analogy between a foreign government, even though benevolent and liberal, with a national government, even though despotic and monarchical. The interests of the foreigner are always opposed to yours; those of the latter are opposed to you only in certain places. The first is foreign rule, the other may be class rule. You can reform only the latter. The latter may be oppressive, brutal and barbarian; but the former is unnatural, a denial of your very existence as a nation, a deliberate attempt to reduce you to the position of beasts of burden. It is deceiving oneself to think that a foreign rule can be reformed. The more benevolent a foreign rule, the more dangerous it must be for your national existence, if it makes you forget your servitude, as it generally does. Let us not forget our own chains. There can be no willing co-operation between a foreign government and a subject people. Let us not hug our yoke to our bosom and be proud of it simply because it is gilded and velveted.

Oh, the folly, the insanity, the self-deception involved in deluding ourselves into the belief that we are serving our country and discharging our duties as the patriotic sons of India while we serve a foreign government. To help our masters in tightening our chains by repressive measures, and be their instruments in insulting, harrassing and imprisoning our countrymen whose only fault is that they are clear-headed and strong-willed enough not to be deluded into false hopes of self-government by stages and not to be tempted by offers of high offices—that is not patriotism.

While reading the life of Charles S Parnell by 'K B. O'Brien, I came upon an incident which seems to me to be very pertinent to the position of those Indians who call themselves Liberals. Describing the interview which Mr. O'Brien, the biographer of Mr. Parnell, had with Mr Gladstone about the prospects of the general election of 1885 in Ireland, he says:—

"I spoke of the Irish Liberals and said that they would be swept off the board". "Irish Liberals," said Mr Gladstone, with an expression of sublime scorn which I shall never forget, "Irish Liberals. Are there any Liberals in Ireland? Where are they? I must confess. . . . that I feel a great deal of difficulty in recognising these Irish Liberals you talk about and—(in delightfully scoffing accents, and with an intonation which has often charmed me in the House of Commons)—I think Ireland would have a good deal of difficulty in recognising them either" (laughing ironically)

I hope the reader can appreciate the ironical laughter of the great Liberal leader of England. What did he mean? Nothing short of this, that a subject country could only have "Nationalists" or "Tories" and nothing between them. For my own part, I maintain that the Indians who call themselves 'Liberals' are doing great injustice to themselves. The great bulk of them are 'Nationalists' to the very core of their being. There is a small section of office-seekers, place-hunters and in different men who are neither 'Liberals' nor 'Nationalists'. They are reactionaries, pure and simple, who are taking shelter behind formulas which have been the refuge of men of their way of thinking in all times, in all ages and in all countries. What are these cries?

'Peace in danger'

'Law and order in danger'.

‘Property in danger’

‘Revolution as against evolution’

Ghosts of anarchy, chaos and disorder visit them every night. Poor souls! They do not think that evolution and revolution are not antagonistic terms. Evolution always ends in Revolution. There can be no revolution without evolution. The birth of a child is a revolution that follows evolution. Revolution is after all not such a dreadful thing. It is a phenomenon which nature loves and without which there can be no progress, either in nature or in human affairs. It has always been a terror to the holders of power and privilege, though it has always defied the machinations of the latter and put in its appearance in due time. We are certainly aiming at a revolution, although a non-violent one, not in defiance of the laws or processes of evolution. Let them criticise our methods as ‘dangerous’, ‘bad’, ‘harmful’ and ‘inadequate’, but let them not indulge in this silly talk of evolution against revolution. For revolution is but rapid evolution.

As to law and order, I have already shown that British laws have in ethics, and according to the latest juristic theory, no binding force upon us. What is the aim and object of our life? What is the end we are striving for? The freedom of our country : its emancipation in order to constitute itself into a sovereign nation for the good of all the communities forming the nation, as well as for the good of the human race. The extent to which the British laws help us in the attainment of these objects is the measure of our loyalty to them. We may even go a step further and say that to the extent to which they do not stand in the way of our attainment of these objects, we shall respect them, but not beyond that. Wherever we feel that loyalty to British laws is a hindrance in the

way of our work for the formulation, expression and assertion of the national will, we must disregard them and suffer the consequences of such disobedience.

All law and order are only means to an end. The peace and order produced and preserved by foreign bayonets is no peace and order. It is an unnatural state of things. It is the peace of death. An order maintained by foreign rule is not the kind of order which leads to progress. Love of such an order and such a peace implies such a kind of shame and humiliation as to make life itself an intolerable burden. Even under a national government there is always a limit to the desire of order and peace.

“The only justification for a claim by government of its obedience is the clear proof that it satisfies the material and moral claims of those over whom it exercises control. We cannot wander on blindly with self-shut eyes, merely because order is convenient. . . . It is in the highest degree difficult to understand what exactly is gained by the empty existence that the state must be strong without giving the valid demonstration of the purpose for which that strength is to be used. Government is only a convention, which men, on the whole, accept because of a general conviction that its effort is for good. Where the machine breaks down, where the purpose of those who drive it becomes to an important class sinister, it is humanly inevitable that an effort towards change should be made. To those who hold the reins of power it was, perhaps, inevitable that such an effort should be regarded as the coronation of anarchy. To oppose the government is, for them, to destroy the state”.

In another place, the same writer discusses the evils of absolutism in self-governed nations. He says :—

"To make the state omni-competent is to leave it at the mercy of any group that is powerful to exploit it. That has been, indeed, one of the main historical causes of social interest. . . . The supreme interest of the state is in justice and it does not necessarily follow that justice and order are in perfect co-relation.

To those who have any understanding of the real meaning of politics, this is only its A.B.C., but unfortunately a long subjection and the servile mentality that results therefrom have made us incapable of understanding the elementary truths. It has stunted our minds and dwarfed our intellects. Our lawyers and jurists are still being fed on the exploded and time-barred theories of Austin and Hegel. They have acquired the legal habit and the legal mind of looking at everything in terms of positive law without the exactness of thought and the logic that insists on first making sure of your facts before applying your law. The most important fact which our lawyers always fail to remember is that the laws for which our implicit loyalty is being claimed were never made by us, or by any of our countrymen. The government which has made those laws is not ours, was not made by us, nor the state which that government represents. The state and the government that have made these laws, have in the making of these laws practically ignored us and our nation. These laws were made by them and in the interest of their rule. We or our people were no parties to their making. Consequently these laws have no *moral* claim on our allegiance. When the British-made laws are based on ethical laws, one is, no doubt, *morally* bound to obey them. Let us clear our minds of all camouflage and cant and face the facts as they are. The government and their laws are not

of our making. They are not responsible to us. They do not recognise our right to alter them. Even the Reforms lay emphasis on the fact that they owe their birth not to any desire or wish of ours, but to the goodwill of the British—"the faith that is in us," as they call it in the Montagu-Chelmsford report. The Reforms do not recognise our right to national sovereignty, or even to our existence as a consciously independent political entity. The difference between 'votable' and 'non-votable' items of state expenditures tells its own tale. In face of these facts what we need are not *Reforms*, but rebirth and reconstruction. As a nation we have been dead. Our present attempt is to be reborn. The fact of our rebirth will be computed a revolution, but it will not take place unless and until we have passed through years and months of preparatory evolution. The preparatory evolution will involve much suffering and distress, much forbearance and patience, much nausea and pain. All this we all must put up with if we want to be reborn. The process of rebirth is a process of pain but nothing can come into existence without pain. In this period of preparatory evolution it is no business of ours to help the operation of forces that are opposed to our rebirth. If there are any who have not the strength and the courage to help the processes of evolution, let them stand aloof and watch the development. But to be active agents in the hands of your opponents is a sight at once depressing and exasperating. It is time that 'Liberal' Indians should throw away their pseudo-liberalism and don on the armour of pure and simple nationalism. Liberalism is a discredited creed in Europe. It is hypocritical disguise for capitalistic Imperialism. There are some good men among English Liberals, as there are some even among Tories, but

Liberalism as a creed is dead and buried. It is a creed which appeals only to old women in a state of decay and disintegration. To those young and alive it does not appeal. Moreover, there is no occasion yet for a distinction between Liberals and 'non-Liberals' in India. The time for these party labels will come when we have established a real live Sovereign Parliament, with power to make and unmake governments. At present the title is a mere mimicry. However we may differ in our methods, we are all nationalists. The only other possible party is that of the loyalists who want the present system to be perpetuated and who are opposed to our national regeneration.

I have so far discussed the fundamental implications of our political position. The conclusions at which I arrived may be thus summarised :—

- 1 That being a subject people and not a sovereign nation, we have no power to make laws ; nor have we a constitution which owes its existence or its evolution to the sovereign will of the nation

2. That the nation and the state which impose their sovereign rule on us are those of Great Britain

3. That the laws in force in British India have been made by the British and as such, not owing their origin or the sanction to the sovereign will of our nation, are not morally binding on us ; that politically no nation owes any allegiance to laws not made by it, either directly or indirectly through its representatives ; that our allegiance to British-made laws comes not from our consent, but from the compelling force of the might of the British government and that the Government of India is a government established by British law and not by any law made by us.

- 4 That a government imposed on us by a foreign

state by the force of its might is not subject to any changes by our will, as long as we do not evolve and assert our irresistible national will, which should compel the government to look to us for its authority and power.

5. That our first and foremost duty is to evolve and assert such a will

6. That it is futile to think of reforming a foreign government and meaningless to talk of constitutional agitation for the purpose.

7. That the Reform Act of 1919 has made no change in our political status. In fact, it has emphasised our subject condition and established it as a formula for the future.

8. That we owe no co-operation to such a government, nor can our co-operation with them in any way affect and improve our political position

9. That our co-operation with such a government to maintain what is called 'law and order' and to repress and harass those who are engaged in the task of forming a national will is an act of disloyalty to our own people and to our country.

10. That 'law and order' are only means to an end; there have been times when in the interests and for the good of the nation, as well as the protection of the fundamental liberties of the individual and the community, they have been disregarded even by the citizens of a sovereign state; that such times may recur; that both modern theory and practice deny the absolute 'omni-competence of the state' which should make it obligatory on everyone to bend to its will under all circumstances and for all purposes; and that a government can only derive its authority from the nation it governs and so must be responsible to it for all its acts

It may be said in reply that this is all very well in

abstract theory but it is not practical politics. Practical politics require that we should win the good will of the ruling race, use their laws for the purpose of strengthening our position, accept their service in order to get experience in the work of administration and in the meantime build up the nation. Also that being militarily helpless, depending on the British for the defence of our borders and for the protection of our hearths and homes, it is no use our pining for the moon and applying the political theories of sovereign nations to our conditions. It is also said that differences of race and religion and the jealousies and rivalries that arise therefrom are such effective hindrances in the way of our national unity as to make the work of formulation and assertion of the national will extremely difficult, if not altogether impossible, and that pending the attainment of this national unity it is better for us to be governed by the British than to run the risk of being dominated and exploited by some other nation. It is added that in the present state of world politics it is impossible for a country like India to remain free even if the British leave us, and that in that event Japan or Afghanistan or some other power is bound to step in and take us in hand. There are some, who place an implicit faith in the sense of justice of the British, who believe that the British are quite honest and sincere in their promises and pledges* and that now that they have promised to give us Dominion status within as short a time as possible, it is for us to use our opportunities in such a way as to disarm opposition and criticism and to inspire faith in our capacity, loyalty and reasonableness. These latter often talk of "ordered

* This was written before the delivery, on August, of Mr. Lloyd George's now notorious speech on the subject of the position and future of the Indian Civil Service, etc.

progress" and warn their countrymen of the dangers of a revolution and the misery that comes in its train. They hold up the France of 1789 and the Russia of the last few years as examples of revolutionary disasters. Their watchword is 'Progress, steady though slow.'

Some of these points are quite weighty and cogent; others have only a substratum of truth: the rest are absolutely fallacious, based on that lack of individual and national self-confidence which accounts for the continued subordination and passive acquiescence in conditions of national humiliation of large populations to a mere handful of strong-willed and assertive foreigners. It may be true that theories would not help us unless we create facts to accord with those theories.

The European Imperialists maintain that the theories evolved by western thinkers in their progress towards perfection and enduring democracy are not applicable to Eastern conditions of life. Not only political theories but conditions of life too, are so different as to make the western notions of freedom and democracy unsuitable to the people of the East. Consequently, say they, there is no analogy between the countries of the West and the East. If this argument were true, it would knock the bottom out of the theory of Self-Government by stages or by instalments. In a few years, say ten or twenty or even fifty, the East will not be so changed as to become fit to work out western ideas of democracy. And if it does change so rapidly and so completely, it will be an evil day for humanity. By the time the East changes so as to be fit for the political institutions and ideas which are current to-day in the West, the latter itself would be entirely changed and might be on a different track altogether. Are we born only to follow and imitate the West, and always to remain at a distance

from it even when so following and imitating? Are we quite sure that the West is after all on the right track and deserves the intellectual, the political and the economic leadership of the world for all times to come? Are we quite sure that these people—the Vincents and the Haileys of the Indian government, the Butlers and Lloyds of the provinces—are the right persons to lead us to the gates of the democratic harem? Are they disinterested enough, even if intelligent and able, for that rule? Are they superior to the Asquiths, Balfours, Chamberlains and the Lloyd Georges of their native island? If the latter have made a mess of their own country's affairs and have brought it to the verge of bankruptcy and civil war, what guarantee is there that their prototypes in India will do better? Is there any reason for us to believe that the British Indian rulers and pro-consuls, who in the majority of cases have risen to these high positions from the ranks of a bureaucracy, the most despotic and the most cunning that the world has known, are morally better men than the Lloyd Georges, Winston Churchills, Curzons and Chamberlains of Great Britain? The whole past history of Great Britain, the story of its dealings with its colonies in America, Africa and Asia, its diplomatic record in Europe, its dealings with coloured people all over the globe, should put us on our guard against taking its words, promises and pledges on their face value. The truth is that the British are neither worse, nor better than the other Imperial races of the past and the present. They would not be Imperialists, if they were different from what they are. It may be that some-times, even as Imperialists, they are guilty of blunders, but to say so is only to admit that after all they are human. There would be no escape

from Imperialistic clutches if there were no blundering Imperialists. The case of its victims would indeed be hopeless if Imperialism were always served by the best, the cleverest and the most virtuous of men. It is an affection which carries with it the seeds of its own destruction.

To the relief of the dependent and enslaved people, such seeds rapidly fructify when they are watered by Imperialists of the type of Sir Michael O'Dwyer and General Dyer. They rouse these victims to a sense of danger as nothing else does. But Imperialism, at its best, has in itself certain inherent characteristics which bring about its downfall. These are the greed and the lust of power which makes its votaries reckless, haughty, inhuman and overbearing. Even the best of the Imperialists is an enemy of human liberties. Any alliance with him is an alliance with the powers of evil. Submission to Imperialistic rule on the part of a weak and powerless people, their inability to rise against it, the refusal of their leaders to undertake a campaign of violent opposition to it, are entirely different from an alliance with it. The former is the result of their helplessness and impatience; the latter, the evidence of their degeneration. Only a fool or a knave can believe that Imperialists desire the alliance or the co-operation of the leaders of the subject peoples with the object of their own overthrow. We can understand the argument that being militarily helpless, disunited, uneducated and lacking in qualities of head and heart, which are necessary to enable a subject people to assert their national will and set up a government of their own, it is best for them to proceed with care and to avoid attempting things which might prematurely bring them into violent conflict with the rulers. One can appreciate the argument

that under the circumstances the best thing for a subject people is to take advantage of the opportunities that are left to them of consolidating, educating and organising themselves for the day of liberation. One can even comprehend the argument that it is better to put up with the humiliation of being a subject people than attempt freedom by force resulting in enormous bloodshed. But one cannot understand how a member of a subject people can make an alliance with the rulers in order to make their rule more effective, more popular, more enduring and still claim to be a sincere patriot desiring the freedom of his country. The two things are entirely incompatible and inconsistent. Once it is admitted that Imperialism is an evil and a negation of the fundamental rights of the dependent and subject people, any compromise with it, which carries an acquiescence in its methods and a continuance of the system, must be condemned. There can be no Empire without dependent and subject peoples. For these subject or dependent peoples to aspire to a position of partnership in the Empire is an act of disloyalty to the subject country, as it involves condonation of the principle of Imperialism and a denial of the rights of other peoples to be free and self-governing. Accepting the *fact* of foreign rule and acquiescing in its continuance one may for personal ends accept the service of such foreign government, but one can never be a servant and an ally at the same time. A slave may negotiate with his master for his freedom, but he can never be an ally.

Leaving aside the theoretical discussions let us deal with concrete facts. There is nothing in the history of British rule in India which justifies the assumption that the Indians in the service of the British have *even* by a hundredth of an inch advanced the cause of their

country's freedom. On the other hand, there is plenty of evidence that even the best, the most conscientious and the most 'patriotic' of them have been used as tools by the British bureaucracy to enact repressive laws, to administer repressive laws and to apologise for their proceedings on behalf of their masters under what is termed 'ordered progress'. Is it progress ordered from above? Then what is progress? Does the railway mileage represent progress, or do the figures of imports and exports connote progress? Does a big army and a heavy budget indicate progress, or is the increase in the number of government officials a sign of progress? Do magnificent buildings, erected at public expense by a foreign government, to bespeak their glory, represent progress? All this may be 'progress' in a certain sense, yet may also be evidence of the utter helplessness of the people with whose money and at whose cost all this progress is achieved. France was at the zenith of her glory under Louis XIV, but can it be said that that was progress? The Mogul Empire reached its highest pinnacle under Aurangzeb. Was it progress? Russia was a formidable power under Czar Nicholas II. Its Government was most zealous in maintaining law and order. Most of its gifted sons were in exile, either in foreign countries or in Siberia. Freedom of speech, freedom of worship and freedom of association were denied to the people in the name of law and order. Yet the Russians in the employ of the Czar, all stood for progress, and only aimed at ordered progress. How often have law and order been used to cover tyranny and oppression! If the will of the despot is law and the maintenance of that law is order, then have 'law and order' been vindicated by all governments, at all times in history, even by the most tyrannical and the most

cruel among them, then there was never any justification for revolt against government authority, however mild its form. Let us assume for the sake of argument that the British Indian government is a national government of our own. Let us forget that it is a foreign government. What would be our duty if such a government passed a Rowlatt Act under the circumstances it did, or committed an outrage, or applied the Criminal Amendment Act to the Indian National Congress, or proclaimed the Seditious Meetings Act, or gagged the Press. I contend that a self-respecting, progressive, democratic people would have done exactly what we have done under the circumstances, perhaps even more.

"The supreme interest of the State is in justice and it does not necessarily follow that justice and order are in perfect co-relation." There are times when the business of law is not the maintenance of an old equilibrium but the creation of a new one. Let those Indians who talk so glibly of 'law and order' and 'ordered progress' remember that in the advance of humanity 'few things are more fatal than the triumph of authority over truth'. On these notions of law and order, as they are entertained by some of our countrymen, it would be impossible for any country to make any advance towards freedom. Even in self-governed countries, freedom is not a stationary thing. It is always progressing. And wherever the governments are not sufficiently responsive to the new ideas of freedom entertained by the people, the latter have to enforce their point of view on the governing class or classes by not making a fetish of 'law and order.' Says Lasky: "Wherever, in a state, a group of persons large enough to make its presence felt demands the recognition of certain claims, it will not recognise a law which attempts defiance of them; nor

will it accept the authority by which the law is enforced." This is not a new political maxim, but one which is amply corroborated by the facts of history. These principles acquire even greater force, when considered in relation to a country which is being governed by the will of a foreign state which denies even elementary freedom to the people it governs. Let it not be forgotten even for a minute that, with us, it is not a question of the expansion of our liberties, but it is a question of *our being born a free nation*. A nation governed by another, has no liberties, except such as are allowed to it by its masters, either as a matter of grace or enlightened self-interest. These are not liberties, but concessions which may any time be withdrawn by the power that granted them. The point is being emphasised from day to-day by the Anglo-Indian Press and is the fundamental basis of the Reforms Act of 1919. But what we, the nationalists, are after, are not *concessions* but *rights*. At present we have no rights. It is a matter of great humiliation that even the best intellects in the country cannot see this point. They feel no shame in talking of concessions, in asking for them, and in agitating for them. This creates a solid wall of principles between the nationalists and the moderates. The former are constructivists, the latter are mere reformers. The former want a rebirth, the latter a mere continuance, though under better conditions, of their present subordinate life. The former want the people to come to theirs—by their own efforts; the latter want a kind Providence to throw their crumbs from its beautiful table. The former are "rightarians", if I may coin such a word, and the latter "charitarians". What we want is *evolution from below*, what our opponents are after is *a gift from above*. What ~~the~~ nationalists assert is the *right of manhood* for which

they are prepared to pay the price ; what the moderates seek is *a condition of gilded bondage to develop into manhood at some future time, without much trouble in the process* The moderates in their supreme wisdom often label the 'nationalists' as 'impatient visionaries' and 'revolutionaries,' and themselves as apostles of 'ordered progress' and 'evolutionaries'. The fact is that they do not understand what national evolution implies and involves Acquiescence in the existing order and dependence on the benevolence of those whose imperial interest is opposed to our national evolution is not seeking progress by evolution. A subject people cannot evolve into a self-governing nation unless it is prepared to struggle for it. The struggle does not consist in seeking offices and in accepting honours from those who do not believe either in your right or in your capacity to determine the steps in your evolution, and who insist that they and they alone must be judges of these steps. It is travesty of language to call that evolution. Intelligent evolution assumes active and intelligent struggle. The nation will never evolve into a self-governing state if it were to follow the methods of the moderates. The latter deny the people a right to assert their rights and to put forth energy to enforce them, if by doing so they have to do things which are displeasing and disconcerting to their political masters. To win their political and economic freedom by the willing consent of their masters is their goal. To win our political and economic freedom inspite of the other party's denial of our rights, and in spite of his wish to keep us out of them, is our effort. In this effort a certain amount of conflict is inevitable. The best amongst us are determined not to let that conflict lead to bloodshed ; but to let that

conflict be determined by considerations of mere legality is to show one's ignorance of both nature and history. The fact is that the moderates are not democratic at all. They do not care for the people. What they are aiming at is power for a few. They seem to be afraid of the people. They do not want the people to get strong and acquire the power of asserting and enforcing their will. They want to impose their will on them. This they can only do by an alliance with the authorities. The latter are prepared to share their power with a class of Indians, whom they can easily coerce or please, but they do not want the people to develop power and strength and unity. The tragedy of the thing, however, lies in the fact that the moderates cannot see this. They believe, many of them quite honestly and sincerely, that they are all working *for the people* and in their interest. The difference between the two parties is thus not one of speed, nor of mere method, but of fundamental principles.

Power from above is a two-edged sword. It is more demoralising and corrupting than power from below. The former breeds insolence, pride, helplessness and narrowed vision; the latter teaches humility, forbearance, constant vigilance and constant sacrifice. The former depends on the pleasure of a few, the latter on the pleasure of many. It is true that in the hands of small people the latter also may lead to demoralisation and corruption. But the first spoils even *the best* of men. It is the most dangerous thing for a member of a subject race to share power with their rulers. It is liable to make them mere tools of the latter, even against their will.

As for experience in administration, this is again a shibboleth. What experience had Lord Reading or Dr. Saprú, or Mr. (now Sir Mohammed) Shafi or Mr. Sarma? What experience had Lord Peel?

Let me not be misunderstood I am no advocate of rashness or fool-hardiness. Let us be careful by all means; but carefulness does not mean procrastination or subservience Let us lead the nation on the *right lines*, however slow the progress may be, but for God's sake let us not confirm their slavish mentality and habits of acquiescence and passivity by our own *narrow-mindedness and narrow vision*.

APPENDIX II

CONGRESS RESOLUTIONS

The following is the text of the Non-co-operation resolution passed at the Special Session of the Congress held at Calcutta :—

“In view of the fact that on the Khilafat question both the Indian and Imperial Governments have signally failed in their duty towards the Mussalmans of India, and the Prime Minister has deliberately broken his pledged word given to them, and that it is the duty of every non-Moslem Indian in every legitimate manner to assist his Mussalman brother in his attempt to remove the religious calamity that has overtaken him ;

“And in view of the fact that in the matter of the events of the April of 1919 both the said Governments have grossly neglected or failed to protect the innocent people of the Punjab and punish officers guilty of unsoldierly and barbarous behaviour towards them, and have exonerated Sir Michael O'Dwyer who proved himself directly responsible for most of the official crimes and callous to the sufferings of the people placed under his administration, and that the Debate in the House of Lords betrayed a woeful lack of sympathy with the people of India and showed virtual support of the systematic terrorism and frightfulness adopted in the Punjab and that the latest Viceregal pronouncement is proof of entire absence of repentance in the matters of the Khilafat and the Punjab.

“This Congress is of opinion that there can be no contentment in India without redress of the two afore-

mentioned wrongs and that the only effectual means to vindicate national honour and to prevent a repetition of similar wrongs in future is the establishment of Swarajya

"This Congress is further of opinion that there is no course left open for the people of India but to approve of and adopt the policy of progressive non-violent Non-co-operation inaugurated by Mr Gandhi until the said wrongs are righted and Swarajya is established.

"And, inasmuch as a beginning should be made by the classes who have hitherto moulded and represented public opinion and inasmuch as Government consolidates its power through titles and honours bestowed on the people, through schools controlled by it, its law-courts and its Legislative Councils, and inasmuch as it is desirable in the prosecution of the movement to take the minimum risk and to call for the least sacrifice compatible with the attainment of the desired object, this Congress earnestly advises—

(a) surrender of titles and honorary offices and resignation from nominated seats in the local bodies ;

(b) refusal to attend Government Levees, Durbars and other official and semi-official functions held by Government officials or in their honour ;

(c) gradual withdrawal of children from schools and colleges owned, aided or controlled by Government, and, in place of such schools and colleges, establishment of National Schools and Colleges in the various Provinces ;

(d) gradual boycott of British courts by lawyers and litigants, and establishment of private arbitration courts by their aid for the settlement of private disputes ;

(e) refusal on the part of the military, clerical

and labouring classes to offer themselves as recruits for service in Mesopotamia ;

(f) withdrawal by candidates of their candidature for election to the Reformed Councils and refusal on the part of the voters to vote for any candidate who may, despite the Congress advice, offer himself for election ,

(g) boycott of foreign goods

And inasmuch as Non-co-operation has been conceived as a measure of discipline and self-sacrifice without which no nation can make real progress, and inasmuch as an opportunity should be given in the very first stage of Non-co-operation to every man, woman and child, for such discipline and self-sacrifice, this Congress advises adoption of Swadeshi in piece-goods on a vast scale; and inasmuch as the existing mills of India with indigenous capital and control do not manufacture sufficient yarn and sufficient cloth for the requirements of the nation, and are not likely to do so for a long time to come, this Congress advises immediate stimulation of further manufacture on a large scale by means of reviving hand-spinning in every home and hand-weaving on the part of the millions of weavers who have abandoned their ancient and honourable calling for want of encouragement."

The following is the resolution of Non-co-operation as passed at the Nagpur Congress .—

"Whereas in the opinion of the Congress, the existing Government of India has forfeited the confidence of the country, and whereas the people of India are now determined to establish Swaraj, and whereas all methods adopted by the people of India prior to the last special session of the Indian National Congress have failed to secure due recognition of their rights and liberties

and the redress of their many grievous wrongs, more specially in reference to Khilafat and the Punjab, now this Congress, while reaffirming the resolution on non-violent Non-co-operation passed at the special session of the Congress at Calcutta, declares that the entire or any part or parts of the scheme of non-violent Non-co-operation, with the renunciation of voluntary association with the present Government at one end and the refusal to pay taxes at the other, should be put in force at a time to be determined by either the Indian National Congress or the All-India Congress Committee, and that in the meanwhile to prepare the country for its effective steps should continue to be taken in that behalf—

(a) by calling upon the parents and guardians of school children (and not the children themselves) under the age of 16 years to make greater efforts for the purpose of withdrawing them from such schools as are owned, aided or in any way controlled by Government and concurrently to provide for their training in National Schools or by such other means as may be within their power in the absence of such schools;

(b) by calling upon the students of the age of 16 and over to withdraw without delay irrespective of consequences from institutions owned, aided or in any way controlled by Government, if they feel that it is against their conscience to continue in institutions which are dominated by a system of Government which the nation has solemnly resolved to bring to an end, and advising such students either to devote themselves to some special service in connection with the Non-co-operation movement or to continue their education in National institutions;

(c) by calling upon the trustees, managers and teachers of Government-affiliated or aided schools and

Municipalities and Local Boards to help to nationalize them ;

(d) by calling upon lawyers to make greater efforts to suspend their practice and to devote their attention to national service including boycott of law courts by litigants and fellow-lawyers and the settlement of disputes by private arbitration ;

(e) in order to make India economically independent and self-contained by calling upon merchants and traders to carry out a gradual boycott of foreign trade relations, to encourage hand-spinning and hand-weaving, and in that behalf by having a scheme of economic boycott planned and formulated by a Committee of experts to be nominated by the All-India Congress Committee ;

(f) and generally, inasmuch as self-sacrifice is essential to the success of Non-co-operation, by calling upon every section and every man and woman in the country to make the utmost possible contribution of self-sacrifice to the national movement ;

(g) by organizing Committees in each village or group of villages, with a provincial central organisation in the principal cities of each province, for the purpose of accelerating the progress of Non-co-operation ;

(h) by organising a band of national workers for the service to be called the Indian National Service ;

(i) by taking effective steps to raise a national fund to be called the All-India Tilak Memorial Swarajya Fund for the purpose of financing the foregoing National Service and the Non-co-operation movement in general.

“ This Congress congratulates the nation upon the progress made so far in working the programme of Non-co-operation specially with regard to the boycott of Councils by the voters, and claims in the circumstances in which they have been brought into existence that the new

Councils do not represent the country and trusts that those who have allowed themselves to be elected in spite of the deliberate abstention from the polls of an overwhelming majority of their constituents will see their way to resign their seats in the Councils, and that if they retain their seats in spite of the declared wish of their respective constituencies in direct negation of the principle of democracy the electors will studiously refrain from asking for any political service from such councillors.

"This Congress recognises the growing friendliness between the police and the soldiers and the people, and hopes that the former will refuse to subordinate their creed and country to the fulfilment of orders of their officers, and by courteous and considerate behaviour towards the people will remove the reproach hitherto levelled against them that they are devoid of any regard for the feelings and sentiments of their own people; and this Congress appeals to all people in Government employment pending the call of the nation for the resignation of their service to help the national cause by importing greater kindness and stricter honesty in their dealings with their people and fearlessly and openly to attend all popular gatherings whilst refraining from taking any active part therein and more specially by openly rendering financial assistance to the national movements.

"This Congress desires to lay special emphasis on non-violence being the integral part of the Non-co-operation resolution and invites the attention of the people to the fact that non-violence in word and deed is as essential between people themselves as in respect of the Government, and this Congress is, of opinion that the spirit of violence is not only contrary to the growth of a true spirit of democracy, but actually retards the enforcement (if necessary) of the other stages of Non-co-operation.

“ Finally, in order that the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs may be redressed and Swarajya established within one year, this Congress urges upon all bodies whether affiliated to the Congress or otherwise, to devote their exclusive attention to the promotion of non-violence and Non-co-operation with the Government, and in as much as the movement of Non-co-operation can only succeed by a complete co-operation amongst the people themselves, this Congress calls upon the public associations to advance Hindu-Muslim Unity, and the Hindu delegates of this Congress call upon the leading Hindus to settle all disputes between Brahmins and non-Brahmins wherever they may be existing, and to make special efforts to rid Hinduism of the reproach of untouchability and respectfully urges the religious heads to help the growing desire to reform Hinduism in the matter of its treatment of the suppressed classes ”

GANESAN'S PUBLICATIONS

To The Students

BY C F. ANDREWS

Re. 1

In this book Mr. C F. Andrews makes an inspiring appeal to the younger generation to do their duties by the motherland showing why and how they should discharge them in this critical period of her struggle

His exhortations to students are couched in that breadth of view and vision which an idealist alone can command. The elder folk no less than the students stand to profit by a perusal of these essays.—*Janmabhumi*

The Dawn of a New Age and other Essays

BY W W. PEARSON

Re. 1

A new age is dawning on us, an age of liberty, equality, and fraternity, not only but also of universal love. The signs of it are seen in the political and economic spheres as well as in the educational and the moral. In this book, Mr. W W Pearson, whose associations with India are too well-known to need any reminding points, out with elaborate references to the Irish, American and Japanese movements, that there is great scope in India for constructive work in the economic and the educational spheres. Analysing the salient features of the Tagore educational movement and Mahatma Gandhi's work and personality, he shows how they are essentially the harbingers in India of the dawn of a new age.

Greater India

BY RABINDRANATH TAGORE

Re. 1

It is critical as well as constructive with special reference to Indian conditions. The underlying philosophy is idealistically the same as that of Plato and Hegel

It is, in short, the poetical presentation of the "ultimate good" spiritually portrayed once for all in the Sermon on the Mount, which modern philosophy tends to characterise as, after all, supra-national and supra-social.—*Young Men of India*.

S. GANESAN, Triplicane, Madras, S.E.

GANESAN'S PUBLICATIONS

Ahimsa and World Peace or The Case for Non-violence

BY WILFRED WELLOCK

Re. 1-8

Mr Wellock is one of those who suffered for his convictions in the crisis of the late war, and he now presents the case for Pacifism with an ardent and on the whole able advocacy. Every one is agreed that war is a hateful thing, and that it is an unsatisfactory way of settling differences. But the practical man and the idealist part company when it comes to the method by which it can be abolished. The idealist believes in the superlative value of "soul-force" and Ahimsa, or non-violence; the practical man declares that these weapons are useless in the face of a national crisis. The idealist who believes in Pacifism will read this book with enthusiastic approval.—*The Times Literary Supplement*

India in England

BY MISS HELENA NORMANTON

Rs. 2

This is an able survey of the Indian situation since the armistice by one who as editor of *India* had ample opportunities of knowing both the Indian and the English points of view. Besides critical accounts of the Punjab and Khilafat wrongs, it contains an acute and elaborate analysis of the Montagu Reforms and suggests how only the grant of substantial and real self-government can solve the Indian Problem. In a lengthy chapter entitled "Retrospect and Prospect," Miss Normanton adds a sympathetic criticism of the Non-co-operation movement suggesting means whereby the present Congress Programme needs to be amplified in certain directions. Those interested in Indian financial and general administration will also find ample matter to interest them.

S GANESAN, Triplicane, Madras. S.E.

GANESAN'S PUBLICATIONS

Hindu Culture

BY K. S. RAMASWAMY SASTRY, B.A., B.L.

WITH FOREWORD BY SIR JOHN WOODROFFE Rs. 3

If it be a sin to worship one's motherland, to see nothing but perfection in her system of life, and to look upon her culture as the highest expression of the supreme ideal, Mr. Ramaswamy Sastry must be the most offending soul alive. Nevertheless it remains true that much of the inner meaning of Hindu culture is still lost upon the average Englishman. It is perfectly true that, though there are signs of awakening, Hindu art and letters have been neglected in the West. Those who have eyes to see can find much that is of the very highest calibre in Hindu music, art and literature, and it has long been acknowledged that its ancient civilisation was for a life time in advance of the world. Mr. Ramaswamy Sastry rightly insists that if India is to recover her position in the spiritual world, if she is to proclaim her true message, she must cease to imitate the West and follow the lines of her self-realisation along the path of her own peculiar ideals. It is in this direction and in its insistence on the inherent nobility of Hindu culture that this book has its main value.—*The Times Literary Supplement*

Rabindranath Tagore

A STUDY OF HIS LATER WORKS

BY K. S. RAMASWAMY SASTRY, B.A., B.L. Rs. 2

This book is a succinct and harmonious review of the later works of Tagore and going through it the reader will have an idea of the writings studied as a harmonious whole.—*Prabhuddha Bharata*

S. GANESAN. Triplicane, Madras, S.E.

